FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 080 25 April 1983

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Andropov Interview With DER SPIEGEL Magazine AA 1
Bovin on Arms Talks, Missile Deployment [London] AA 10
U.S., UK Explode Underground Nuclear Device AA 12

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Government Statement Issued on U.S. LOS Stance [PRAVDA 24 Apr] CC 1
Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' [Zhurkin, Shishlin, Levin] CC 2
Leninist Principles in Foreign Policy CC 2
Madrid Meeting, European Security CC 4
U.S. 'Window of Vulnerability' CC 6
U.S., West Europe Relations CC 7
U.S. Policy in Central America CC 8
Moscow TV's 23 April 'Studio 9' Program [Zorin, Zamyatin] CC 9
U.S. Interim Solution Discussed CC 9
European Interests in Arms Talks CC 10
U.S. Economic Pressure on France CC 11
Soviet Nonuse of Nuclear Arms CC 12
Soviet Military Threat 'Campaign' CC 12
U.S. Defensive Weapons Plan CC 14
USSR-U.S. Relations CC 15
U.S. Elections, Foreign Policy CC 15
FRG Election Outcome CC 16
USSR-PRC Ties CC 18
USSR-Albanian Relations CC 19
Iran-Iraq War CC 19

NORTHEAST ASIA

USSR, Japan Sign Salmon Accord in Moscow C 1

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

USSR, Egypt Sign Cultural-Scientific Cooperation Plan H 1
'Arafat Receives Message From Soviet 'Leadership' H 1
[TANJUG]
Soviet Delegation Holds Talks With PLO's Abu Mazin H 1
[VOP]
PLO Executive Committee Concludes Tunis Meeting H 1
Reagan Announces Shultz Visit to Middle East H 2
Eagleburger Arrives in Beirut 22 April H 2
Soviet Public Anti-Zionist Committee Created H 2

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Lenin's 113th Birthday Celebrated in Moscow R 1
Itinerary of Events R 1
Gorbachev Lenin Birthday Speech R 2
[PRAVDA 23 Apr]
PRAVDA Editorial [22 Apr] R 16
IZVESTIYA Editorial [22 Apr] R 17
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Editorial [22 Apr] R 18
Soviet Source Says Brezhenv's Son To Be Removed [AFP] R 19
Officials Relieved of Posts; Replacements Made R 20
Georgian Trade Minister R 20
[ZARYA VOSTOKA 17 Apr]
RSFSR Health Minister R 20
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Apr]

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Report on First Quarter Achievements, Shortfalls S 1
Further Details S 1
RSFSR Council of Ministers Notes Economic Growth S 2

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Agricultural Developments for 22-23 April T 1
Shcherbitskiy at Conference on Food Production T 2

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

USSR Launches Artificial Satellite Cosmos-1445 U 1
Scientific Conference Held in Baku 23 April U 1

ANDROPOV INTERVIEW WITH DER SPIEGEL MAGAZINE

LD241532 Moscow TASS in English 1515 GMT 24 Apr 83

[Text] Moscow April 24 TASS -- The West German magazine DER SPIEGEL asked the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Yuriy Andropov to answer a number of questions and also to receive for a conversation the publisher of the magazine Rudolf Augstein. This conversation, as it has been already reported, took place on April 19.

Follows Yuriy Andropov's answers and his conversation with Rudolf Augstein:

Question: There is clearly no progress at the Geneva talks on medium-range weapons in Europe. The American proposal, which contains the "zero option" and since then recently the "interim variant", appears to be incompatible with the Soviet proposal to reduce the number of its missiles to the number of West European medium-range missiles. What, in your view, is the essence of the differences, and do you consider a compromise possible?

Answer: We understand the concern that the questions of limiting medium-range nuclear arms in Europe, that are being discussed at the talks in Geneva, are not finding their solution. These talks, if one is to speak frankly, are deadlocked.

For the sake of what were these talks started? The Soviet side proposed the talks and began them with resolve to press for the reduction of the medium-range nuclear weapons of the USSR and NATO countries existing in that area, for a radical mutual reduction of the level of nuclear confrontation. The purpose of the United States at the Geneva talks, as it has transpired, is to add at all cost new powerful armaments to the already existing vast nuclear arsenal of NATO. And it is only Soviet missiles that it wants to reduce.

As you see, two opposite lines, I would say two fundamentally different approaches, face each other in Geneva. It was even before Geneva that we encountered this line of the Americans. The United States, as is known, derailed the SALT-2 treaty and withdrew from a whole number of talks which were picking up pace or approaching their successful conclusion. I can remind you that the United States has suspended and is avoiding to this day the resumption of talks on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, on anti-satellite systems, on the limitation of deliveries and sale of conventional armaments, on the limitation of military activity in the Indian Ocean. I will add to this the treaties with the Soviet Union on the limitation of underground nuclear weapon tests and on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes that have not been ratified by the United States to this day. All this speaks for itself. And as for the Geneva talks, it is known that the present U.S. Administration has entered them with great reluctance.

For us the attainment of agreement between contracting sides means to reach accord on questions to mutual satisfaction. But the American Administration is behaving as though the age-long history of international relations, the practice of agreements and treaties does not exist. The recent alteration by Washington of its proposal that was falsely called "zero option" and was unacceptable to the USSR from the outset does not change anything. The United States Administration remains on its old one-sided positions and is not showing the slightest desire to take into account the lawful interests of the other side, to reach an hones mutually acceptable agreement. Every single time when setting forth its proposals the United States strives, and this is the most important thing for it, first and foremost to inflict damage to the security of the Soviet Union, to tilt in its favour the existing balance of forces.

This is the main reason for the failures of the talks in Geneva. In reply to our clear-cut and fair proposals the Reagan administration comes up first with the "zero option" and then with the "interim-zero" variant. Both the first and the second are unrealistic and do nothing to facilitate the successful reaching of agreement. Why? Because the intent is to disarm us and to arm NATO even more. We will not accept this.

Lately in the United States and in some other NATO countries one hears talk about the "intransigence" of the Soviet side. But in what, as a matter of fact, must we concede? It is demanded of us that we conclude an agreement only on missiles -- on the existing Soviet medium-range missiles and on the American ones that it is planned to bring to Europe. The Americans simply refuse to reach agreement on the other components of the nuclear medium-range weapons. They declare that they refuse to hold talks on this and that is all.

They want us to pretend that we do not notice the more than 400 warheads on the British and French sea- and land-based missiles which are aimed at the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The Americans, and after them also the representatives of other NATO countries, describe the British and French missiles as a force of "deterrence". I am prepared to allow that that is so. But then the question arises: Why, then, while recognising the right of France and Britain to deterrence, [do] they deny us the right to have our own deterrent force -- exactly in the same amount as in the possession of the French and the British?

It is also said that the nuclear arms of France and Britain should not be counted because they purportedly have some "independent status". But have these countries ceased being members of the North Atlantic Alliance? And do they conceal that their nuclear weapons are directed against the Soviet Union? And is it not symptomatic that the French Government not only is not dissociating itself from the plans of deploying American nuclear missiles in Western Europe but, on the contrary, is zealously supporting them? What "independent status" can there be in this case! On the one hand, the known NATO decision is presented as a sort of mandate to the United States from all members of this alliance and, on the other hand, when NATO'S armaments are beginning to be counted it turns out that the British and French missiles have nothing to do with them, it turns out that they are "independent". There is no logic here.

Try to look at the situation from the viewpoint of the Soviet Union, its lawful interests: On what grounds, by what right are we to be left disarmed in face of these British and French nuclear missiles aimed at our country?

It is clear that we cannot agree and never will agree to this. The Soviet people has the same right to security as the peoples of America, Britain, France and other countries.

We are also asked to ignore the fact that were we to accept the proposals of the Americans they would retain intact in the zone of Europe their aviation at airfields and aircraft carriers, that is the forward-based systems for the delivery of nuclear weapons capable of reaching the territory of the Soviet Union. And we are speaking here of as many as hundreds of delivery vehicles and thousands of nuclear warheads.

The violation of generally accepted norms of conducting talks and the refusal to work for the attainment of a mutually acceptable accord expresses itself also in the attempts of the United States Administration to disarm us unilaterally not only in the west, in Europe, but also in the east, in Asia. Washington would like to dictate its terms to us -- not to deploy our medium-range missiles in the Asian part of the Soviet Union.

This of course, totally transcends the framework of the Geneva talks. The Americans are keeping silent that they have concentrated numerous nuclear weapons against us in Asia, in the Pacific and Indian Oceans, and in the Far East. By the way, time and again there are reports in the American and British press about the intention of the United States to station its medium-range missiles in Alaska. Were that to happen, it would not have gone unnoticed from our side. I am mentioning this now as a confirmation of the conclusion that the American side is demanding from the Soviet Union something which it itself evidently has no intention of observing.

So the question is who has more reason to show concern about his security?

It is the more justifiable to pose the question in this manner because the Soviet Union, as is known, has undertaken not to be the first to use nuclear arms whereas the NATO nuclear countries are flatly refusing to this day to assume such an obligation.

Question: The West and the East accuse each other of striving for military superiority. The Americans even contend that the Soviet representatives at the Geneva talks strive to perpetuate the USSR's superiority in medium-range missiles in the European Continent. How should an approximate balance look like?

Answer: We know of such contentions. American military and political leaders are trying particularly hard in this. I must say, however, that some other politicians in the West are not trailing far behind them. There is not a grain of truth in such contentions. One must stand on the ground of facts. In recent times alone the Soviet Union, wishing to move the talks off dead centre, presented for consideration by the American side and other NATO countries a whole number of proposals of a clearly constructive nature.

Suffice it to recall our proposals at the already mentioned Geneva talks on the limitation of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. At present each side in Europe has about a thousand medium-range carrier vehicles of nuclear weapons. Plus several thousand tactical nuclear warheads each. Were our most far-reaching proposal accepted, incidentally in the West they bashfully prefer to hush it up, there would have remained no types of nuclear weapons at all in the European Continent, weapons intended to hit targets in Europe, both medium-range and tactical ones. Will Europe, European security win or lose from the implementation of this proposal? The answer is clear and unequivocal.

The same applies to another proposal we have made. Were it implemented, there would have been a radical reduction: Each side would have had the number of its medium-range weapons cut by two thirds. In other words we would have covered two-thirds of the road to fully freeing Europe from these weapons.

Then, had the West accepted the variant proposed by us last December the USSR and the NATO countries would have retained 162 missiles each, that is exactly as many as Britain and France now have on the side of NATO. Each would have retained also 138 medium-range planes. I would like to stress that even these figures are not an absolute. They could be reduced on a mutual basis if NATO would want to.

All these proposals of the Soviet Union remain in force. They fully ensure genuine equality and a real balance of forces.

Where is here any striving of the USSR for military superiority?

The complexity and danger of the present situation is that the arms race imposed by the West is outstripping talks. To avoid this, to create favourable conditions for holding talks common sense tell us that it is necessary to freeze the nuclear arsenals of the sides. It would be most reasonable to do this while other solutions are found. We proposed to freeze the medium-range weapons just as strategic arms. In our opinion this would be only the first step. An objection is raised to this: Why freeze when what we must talk about is reduction? True, this sounds nice but the trouble is that while this is being declared armaments are being built up at the same time. So what we have is no freeze and no reduction.

The contrast is just as sharp when comparing the approaches of the USSR and the USA to other problems of limiting and reducing arms.

I have already mentioned our commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. If the United States and other NATO members possessing nuclear weapons made an analogous statement people throughout the world would heave a sigh of relief. Why not do this? But our initiative encounters a wall of silence.

Here is another example. What can justify the failure of the West to react to this day to the honest proposal made by the Soviet Union together with the other socialist countries with the best of intentions to conclude between the countries of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO a treaty on the non-use of military force and on the maintenance of relations of peace? It is hard to find a sensible explanation of this.

Or let us take a look at how one side and the other behave at the talks on strategic arms. Let us compare the two positions. We propose substantial, by more than a quarter, reductions of the total number of strategic carrier vehicles without any whatsoever exclusions. The number of nuclear warheads on them would also be reduced to equal levels. But on what is the United States insisting? It only talks about reductions while in reality is working for a substantial, really "radical" build up of its strategic arms. It is planned to additionally deploy more than 12,000 long-range cruise missiles alone. I will refer to the latest news from Washington: Yet another plan has been placed on the President's desk -- to deploy in the coming years on additional considerable number of intercontinental ballistic missiles of a new type.

This is an unbridled arms race. There is no other term for this.

Neither is it a secret that the United States is stockpiling and planning the use also of such a terrible weapon of mass annihilation as chemical weapons. These weapons are already being brought to Europe and new, even more baleful types of these weapons are being intensively developed in the United States. We are proposing to ban the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and to destroy them altogether. It would seem that there is nothing and cannot be anything contentious here. But there are people both in the United States and in Western Europe who praise the "usefulness" of such weapons.

I cannot but say a few words about the problem of verification of arms reduction. It is said that the Soviet Union is supposedly against verification and for this reason it is difficult to reach agreement with it. Using a German expression, this is an "old hat", a threadbare thesis. For us verification is important no less, if not more, than for others. We approach questions of verification concretely and not in terms of general declarations. This approach of ours has found its embodiment in the agreements on the limitation of strategic arms.

Our policy in questions of verification is a far-reaching one -- right up to and including the establishment of general and complete verification when matters reach general and complete disarmament. We are against the turning of the problem of verification into a stumbling block at talks.

Such is the true picture. I have cited only some facts. The list could be continued but from what has already been said it is evident what positions in questions of disarmament are held by the Soviet Union and what positions are held by the United States.

Now judge for yourself who strives for military superiority and who strives for parity, for lessening the level of military confrontation.

Question: During the period to 1987 President Reagan of the United States intends to boost spending on armaments to the gigantic sum of 1600 billion dollars. He plans the creation of the MX intercontinental missile, the Pershing-2 missile, cruise missiles and even an anti-ballistic missile system deployed in space that is to make the United States invulnerable. What do you intend to range against that?

Answer: It has become a vogue with members of the Reagan administration when they are exposed of having militaristic, aggressive ambitions to strike the pose of feeling hurt. Such a pose perhaps might impress some people who are not well versed in politics. And that appears to be its intent. But in such cases it is best to turn to facts. And facts show that the United States has embarked on the road of unleashing an unprecedented arms race along all directions and is spiraling international tension to the limit.

I concretely refer to Washington's announced plans of developing a large-scale and highly effective anti-ballistic missile defence. The adventurism and danger of this entire idea is that the emphasis in it is made on impunity, on delivering the first nuclear strike thinking that they can protect themselves from the reply strike. From here it is not far from the temptation to reach out for the firing button. This is the main danger of the new American military concept. It is capable only of bringing the world closer to the nuclear precipice. It comes out that while they are speaking of defence in reality they are planting a mine under the entire process of limiting strategic arms.

Authoritative scientists of the world are saying that this is exactly the case. We are offering the United States Government: Let Soviet and American scientists, specialists in this field meet and discuss the possible consequences of creating a large-scale anti-ballistic missile defence system. Let science say its weighty word.

It is becoming increasingly evident that the development of cosmic means of waging war is a component part of the American military preparations. They want to go into outer space with arms and from there to threaten mankind. This should not be allowed to happen. Outer space must remain peaceful. We proposed to conclude an international treaty on the non-deployment of any types of weapons in space. We are convinced that it is necessary to advance even further: to reach agreement on prohibiting altogether the use of force both in outer space and from outer space in respect of the earth.

Not to start the arms race where it did not exist, and stop it where it is now taking place. This is the essence of our position, and this is what we guide ourselves by at talks.

The Soviet Union will further consistently search for and strive to find a common tongue with the American side. Our earlier made proposals remain in force. Should the American Administration come up with proposals on some problem, proposals directed at its solution in the spirit of equal security, we will definitely study them in a positive spirit.

Question: The Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl is planning to visit Moscow soon. What is your opinion of the prospects of relations between the USSR and the FRG and do you see possibilities for cooperation if the Kohl government implements the so-called NATO rearmament?

Answer: Peaceful, businesslike cooperation between the USSR and the Federal Republic is a substantial factor of stability in Europe and in international life as a whole. I think it is in the interests both of the FRG and the Soviet Union to preserve this. A basis for this exists, a good basis. This is the Moscow treaty and a whole number of other agreements concluded by our countries in the 1970's. This is the jointly accumulated experience of practical cooperation in various fields.

Chancellor Helmut Kohl's visit, on which agreement in principle has been reached, is expected in the Soviet Union. We hope that during the visit we will succeed in consolidating the positive elements that exist in relations between our countries and outline prospects for the future.

At the same time, when evaluating the prospects of our relations we cannot, naturally, abstract ourselves from the plans of deploying new American nuclear missiles in the FRG.

Judge for yourself what a damage would be inflicted to these relations if the territory of the FRG were turned into a bridgehead for delivering a nuclear strike at the USSR and its allies. Should this happen this would mean most grave consequences for the FRG itself.

But I repeat, the Soviet Union is an emphatic opponent of such a turn of events. We propose a different way out of the present situation that would strengthen the security both of the FRG and the Soviet Union and would allow both our countries to successfully cooperate in the interests of consolidating European and world peace.

Rudolf Augstein: I am very happy at the opportunity to meet and talk with the highest leader of the Soviet Union. We have already formulated some questions and got answers to them in written form. I must say that before our meeting I have already studied the text of your answers. I do not know if you will now hand it over to me officially or it can be considered that it has already been handed over to us.

Yuriy Andropov: I am prepared to give you this text. I think that is the most reasonable and convenient way. Does it suit you?

Rudolf Augstein: Yes of course. Thank you. But since no text can be exhaustive, I would like to ask your permission to put here several additional questions to you.

Yuriy Andropov: Please.

Rudolf Augstein: One can often hear contentions in the West that during a certain period, when the United States was not arming itself at the rate it is doing and is planning to do now, the Soviet Union had actively built up its armaments. As a result, according to these contentions, in the course of the 1970's the Soviet armaments increased while the American ones had even decreased.

Yuriy Andropov: These contentions are not new. They are especially actively being disseminated by the Americans but they are being helped also by their NATO allies. I did not prepare specially for the answer to this question, but it is easy to prove that the contentions quoted by you are at variance with reality. If one is to start from the beginning allow me to remind you that it was not the Soviet Union that invented atomic weapons and was the first to include them in its arsenal. After all, there was a lengthy period when we had no such weapons altogether while the Americans had them and tried to blackmail us and the whole world for that matter. We had to catch up with them. Several years passed and the Soviet Union, too, got its atomic weapons. We were forced to do that. That is how it all happened.

Rudolf Augstein: But did not the top Soviet leadership themselves admit in 1977 that there was rough parity in armaments between the two sides?

Yuriy Andropov: Precisely so. But I have not yet finished answering your question. If we trace subsequent developments through a number of stages, they were as follows: The United States began intensively to improve its nuclear weaponry. They went over from single to cluster warheads. Then we had to do so too. Then the Americans adopted multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles. We had to do the same in response. Then the United States began to install MIRV missiles in its submarines, which we did not have at the time. So we had to respond in kind here as well.

There is an approximate balance of forces, we continue to believe so today too, there is rough parity.

So, things have always stood in such a way that we have only followed the Americans in the arms buildup, not vice versa. Moreover, catching up with the United States, we have always suggested that this race be ended, that the levels of armaments of both sides be frozen and subsequently reduced. Regrettably, we have received no consent of the American side to this proposal.

Discussing the situation at present, we, of course, can consider it in different ways, using different methods and approaches. The United States, for instance, believed that its nuclear weapons would be more invulnerable if it installed them in submarines. And it did so. This is understandable because the United States is a sea power. We are a land power and most of our nuclear weapons were deployed on land. Now the Americans suggest reductions in land-based nuclear weapons, leaving sea-based missiles aside. We, naturally, take exception to this approach. We for our part take account of all the types of nuclear weapons available to both sides and suggest even reductions in them on both sides, reductions to the point of their eventual complete elimination.

As for detailed data on the balance of forces between the two sides, our Defence Minister Dmitriy Ustinov recently made a public statement on this subject and supplied detailed facts and figures. You can easily have a look at those figures and see the truth of what I have been telling you here.

Rudolf Augstein: Many West Europeans think that they are particularly threatened by Soviet SS-20 missiles, which are a new and quite effective type of weapon.

Yuriy Andropov: As a matter of fact, this subject has been covered in the text of my answers to the questions received from you. But I can say the following in addition. I understand that the peoples of Europe feel concerned and even worried. We stand for removing causes for this worry.

We have suggested different options. We have proposed the removal from Europe of all the nuclear weapons altogether, both medium-range and tactical ones. The United States has not even responded to this proposal of ours. It has continued stubbornly to press its so-called "zero option", which does not even deserve being dwelt upon here. We have demonstrated its true worth on many occasions. So you and I do not differ in the sense of concern with the existing situation. But the United States would like to deploy its nuclear missiles in the territory of Western Europe, to make you, the West Germans, and the Belgians, and the Dutch its hostages. We are against this. We have proposed different ways out of the situation, making it possible either to remove the mutual threat altogether or considerably to lessen existing tension.

Rudolf Augstein: The Soviet Union has stated that if the Geneva talks do not lead to positive results and if the Americna missiles are nevertheless deployed in Europe, the USSR will deploy its missiles at roughly the same distance from U.S. territory. I would like to ask you, Mr. General Secretary, if you are really going to do so, and if you are, in what parts of the world could your missiles be deployed?

Yuriy Andropov: I will not tell you this even as a secret -- for obvious reasons. But turning to the crux of the matter, I want to confirm: We will find ways to counter the Americans actions both with regard to U.S. territory directly and with regard to Europe. Nuclear arms talks are not a game of poker, in which if you lose heavily you can hope to make your loss good afterwards. These talks involve literally life and death questions for the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States, the Warsaw Treaty countries and the NATO countries. We cannot take lightly the prospect of more than 500 nuclear missiles being deployed close to our borders in addition to those French and British missiles which are already targeted at us. Our measures in response will be perfectly justified from any point of view, including the point of view of the highest moral standards.

Rudolph Augstein: you have mentioned here the French missiles, and this has prompted me to recall another issue. The Soviet had very good relations with France, and it so happened that it was a government of Socialists, in which the Communists participate, that demanded that about 50 Soviet diplomats and other officials leave France. How do you assess this development?

Yuriy Andropov: What can I say on this score? First and foremost, I would not like to see the blame for this crude provocative move against Soviet people be laid with the French Socialists and, still less so, with the Communists. We are well aware of the fact that behind this action there are forces which do not want to see good relations of France with the Soviet Union. And it is possible that these forces exist not only in France itself but also beyond it. It is hardly likely that this action meets France's national interests. This is an act of arbitrariness. It has no legal foundations whatsoever. Any assertions that Soviet people allegedly engaged in impermissible activities -- are inventions.

I would also like to note this fact. Among the Soviet people who were told to leave France, there are officials who have not worked in France for the last half-year and are staying in the Soviet Union, while others had not even worked in France for more than two weeks. Is this not absurd?

We are told only one thing: that the Soviet officials engaged in collecting information. But, as far as I understand it, the functions of the diplomatic and other services of any country, of any embassy, include collection of information about the host country, and transmission of it to their government. Is this impermissible activity? It has been laid down in international diplomatic conventions.

This action of the French authorities cannot be qualified otherwise than as deliberately aimed at worsening Soviet-French relations.

Some of the press organs in France assert that the absence of response measures on our part with regard to the French officials in Moscow is alleged to constitute an indirect admission by the Soviet Union of its "guilt." This is nonsense. If someone interprets our actions in this manner, he shows his lack of understanding of the Soviet foreign policy. To adopt reply measures with regard to the French working in the USSR would be the easiest thing to do. In exercising restraint, we are guided by the broad interests of the Soviet-French relations which we hold dear and which evolved over a long period of time, by the interests of preserving detente in Europe.

This does not mean, however, that we shall tolerate, wherever it may be, arbitrariness vis-a-vis Soviet diplomats and other officials working in our missions abroad.

Rudolf Augstein: Yes, one can say that, in this case, you acted following the Bible's recommendation that if they hit you on one cheek, you turn the other.

Yuriy Andropov: Not quite. We bear little likeness to biblical characters. We were guided by sober political discretion, and the desire to prevent a deterioration of Soviet-French relations, and we took a broader view of things than that of this narrow local conflict.

Rudolf Augstein: Since we have already referred to biblical themes, I would like to say this. President Reagan, addressing a religious gathering, declared the Soviet Union to be the "centre of evil". In your answer to that statement, you provided your assessment of it. But I would like to ask this: Are reasonable and successful negotiations possible at all in such an atmosphere?

Yuriy Andropov: We are realists enough not to pay attention to rhetorics. If Reagan, besides his charges, adopted at least one of our concrete proposals on questions of arms reductions, or put forward himself at least one reasonable, suitable proposal, we would forgive him his -- how shall I put it mildly -- groundless statement. The French are probably right when they say that each one uses the language which is his own.

Rudolf Augstein: It rarely happens that all evil and all the blame lie with one side only, even if it seems to the East with respect to the West, or to the West with respect to the East. In this connection, I must ask this: Namely, are they in the Soviet Union aware of the extent to which the question of Afghanistan spoils the international atmosphere -- and are there any plans for doing away with such a situation?

Yuriy Andropov: In answering the first part of your question I shall say: Yes, they are aware of it. Our plans for a political settlement of the Afghan problem are no secret. We have repeatedly stated them publicly. Leonid Ilich Brezhnev spoke about that. We consider that as soon as outside interference in the affairs of Afghanistan has been terminated and non-resumption of such interference guaranteed, we shall withdraw our troops. Our troops are staying in that country at the request of the lawful Afghan Government -- that government which was then in power -- and they continue staying there at the request of the lawful government headed by Babrak Karmal. We are not after anything for ourselves there. We responded to the request for assistance from a friendly neighbouring country. It is, however, far from being a matter of indifference to us what is happening directly on our southern border. Washington even goes as far as arrogating for itself the right to judge what government must be there in Nicaragua, since this, allegedly, affects the U.S. vital interests.

But Nicaragua is over a thousand kilometres away from the USA, and we have a rather long common border with Afghanistan. And so, in assisting friends, we at the same time think of ensuring the interests of our security.

Political negotiations are now under way on settling the problems connected with Afghanistan. True, these negotiations are going on with difficulty, with the Pakistanis, one may say, being held by their sleeve by their overseas friends. We still think, however, that these negotiations, which are being pursued with the assistance of the representative of the U.N. secretary general, have some prospects before them.

Rudolf Augstein: I would like once again to come back to the question of medium-range missiles. In the eventuality that the Americans do deploy them in the FRG, will you continue the talks with the USA on nuclear arms in Europe?

Yuriy Andropov: It has been stressed on the Soviet side more than once that such a course of events would mean an abrupt change for the worse of the situation not only in Europe but on a global plane as well. It is in connection with this, that we would have to adopt the necessary decisions.

Rudolf Augstein: There is yet another issue which is a matter of concern for many in the FRG. It is known that the foreign indebtedness of some of the socialist countries has now assumed extremely dangerous proportions. What way out is possible here in order to avoid a deepening of the crisis? The fact is that we in Europe all depend on one another.

Yuriy Andropov: Since we are speaking about soveriegn states, I can only say that looking for ways out of the problems that arise is a sovereign matter for each particular country. If we are speaking about what the FRG could do for its part, then I can only offer this piece of advice: Carry on trade and develop economic relations, and do not engage in "sanctions".

BOVIN ON ARMS TALKS, MISSILE DEPLOYMENT

LD231223 London BBC Television Network in English 2300 GMT 20 Apr 83

[From the "Newsnight" program: Interview by Aleksandr Bovin, IZVESTIYA political observer, with BBC television correspondent John Tusa at the USSR Embassy in London on 20 April -- all questions in English; all remarks by Bovin in Russian with English translation given in screen caption]

[Text] ["Newsnight" presenter Donald MacCormick] In London at the moment is one of Russia's most important political writers: Aleksandr Bovin, the political observer for the government's newspaper IZVESTIYA. As the political observer, he reflects the thinking of the top leadership in the Politburo in his articles. Mr Bovin is also particularly close to Yuriy Andropov, the Soviet leader. This afternoon John Tusa spoke to him at the Soviet Embassy, asking him first about the chances of continuing arms negotiations with America if cruise and Pershing missile deployment were to go ahead.

[Begin recording] [Bovin] I would like to put this question in a broader context, in East-West terms. Recently, Mr Reagan, the President of the United States, said the Soviet Union is an empire of sin.

[Question] Were you shocked by that?

[Answer] No, but it surprised me. He said the USSR is a concentration of evil.

[Question] Were you surprised that he said it?

[Answer] On the other hand, he said that America is the empire of good, of righteousness. I ask myself: If there is a God and there is a Satan, can there be a detente between God and the Devil?

[Question] So you are saying that Mr Reagan's formulation....

[Bovin, interrupting] If Mr Reagan is more a theologist than a politician, then what sort of detente can we talk about? That is what surprised me.

[Question] Are you therefore saying that negotiation with the United States and NATO, because of Mr Reagan's attitude, is going to be very difficult once cruise and Pershing deployment starts? Will negotiations be broken off at Geneva once deployment starts?

[Answer] We have to deal with both Reagan the theologist and Reagan the politician. If the politician wins over the theologist, then we'll probably have something to talk about with America. In May a new phase of negotiations will start in Geneva. Honestly, I believe that as long as Reagan is in the White House we will not be able to reach a serious agreement. That is my personal point of view, but our government has to be optimistic.

[Question] So, no serious negotiations until the next American President, you think?

[Answer -- in English] Yes.

[Question] Are you therefore worried by the appointment of Kenneth Adelman as the head of the American disarmament effort?

[Answer] Once, in my childhood, I read a book, "David Copperfield" by Dickens, and in it there is a character, Uriah Heep. Now just imagine Uriah Heep appointed as director of the Salvation Army.

[Question] So you don't think that Mr Adelman is capable of serious negotiation?

[Answer] I believe it is yet more proof that America, unfortunately, is not ready for serious negotiations. Compromise is the life-breath of politics. One should search for compromise. But if I am the Devil and you are God, what sort of compromise would there be?

[Question] It has been suggested that the Soviet Union might deploy missiles closer to the United States if Pershing and cruise are themselves deployed. Where do you think those new Soviet missiles might be put?

[Answer] I would like to remind you of one thing: When we stationed our rockets in Cuba the Americans were very nervous. If the Americans station Pershing-2 in West Germany, we, too, are likely to become nervous.

[Question] Are you saying that therefore there is a possibility of another Cuba crisis because of Pershing and cruise?

[Answer] I am worried that what Americans call compromise is really an invitation to a new international crisis.

[Question] A final question: How do you sum up the sort of difference that Mr Andropov's arrival in power has made to the Soviet Union internally?

[Answer] Well, you see, like no other society, Soviet society needs certain changes. I think it was Goethe who cleverly said that life is determined by necessity and change. Even if the basic political principles are intact -- and they are indeed intact -- when a new leader comes, then a fresher atmosphere is developing. As a result it is easier to make the necessary changes and to overcome the inertia of the past. That is roughtly what is now going on in the Soviet Union. It is the correct process. I repeat: necessity and change. [end recording]

U.S., UK EXPLODE UNDERGROUND NUCLEAR DEVICE

LD222102 Moscow TASS in English 2013 GMT 22 Apr 83

[Text] Washington April 22 TASS -- The United States and Britain have jointly exploded an underground nuclear device at the U.S. testing range in Nevada. According to the U.S. Department of Energy, the yield of the blast did not exceed 20 kilotons.

The explosion was made at Britain's request under the 1958 bilateral British-U.S. agreement on cooperation in the use of atomic energy for mutual defence.

GOVERNMENT STATEMENT ISSUED ON U.S. LOS STANCE

LD231218 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Apr 83 First Edition p 1

["Statement by the Soviet Government" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] The U.S. Administration has issued a statement on its policy on the uses of the world ocean and its riches.

The statement points out that, as before, the United States is not going to sign the new United Nations Law of the Sea Convention and proclaims the U.S. intention to act as it sees fit in relations to the riches of the world ocean. In essence, and this is said bluntly, it would like to have such a regime free of political and economic restrictions in relation to the extraction of minerals from the seabed and the ocean floor in the areas which do not fall under the jurisdiction of any country.

Demonstrating thereby disregard for the collective opinion of the overwhelming majority of the states which took part in the elaboration of the convention and singed it, the incumbent U.S. Administration openly declares that American monopolies will unwarrantedly and uncontrolledly appropriate minerals and other resources of the world ocean.

At the same time, the United States proclaimed a 200-mile-wide "exclusive economic zone" along the U.S. coast, within whose boundaries it will be full master of living and mineral resources.

The references in the statement that Washington means to abide by individual articles of the convention should delude nobody.

They are just an unseemly maneuver. Without signing the convention and without assuming the obligations which it imposes, the United States would like at the same time, where this meets its selfish interests, to enjoy the rights and advantages granted by the convention to its signatories. The United States thereby ingores the fact that the convention is integral and indivisible; it is a thoroughly balanced "package" of accords on all closely interlinked problems related to the regime of the marine expanses and uses of the ocean's living and mineral resources.

Any attempts to arbitrarily pick out some of its provisions while discarding others are incompatible with the law and order established by the convention and are directed against the legitimate interests of the other states.

It is perfectly obvious that, having refused together with a few other states to sign the convention, the United States is now doing everything to impart a semblance of legality to its unilateral actions and to try to legalize its absolutely illegal claims in relation to the world ocean and its riches.

It is well known that in the course of the many years of work of the UN Law of the Sea conference the United States exerted much effort to hinder the attainment of balanced compromises and to secure for itself a special regime in the world's oceans. Washington was guided solely by one aim -- that of laying its hands on as big a piece of the pie as possible. Those claims were rejected by the participants in the conference.

The convention, which has already been signed by more than 120 countries, equally takes into consideration the interests of all states and groups of states. Neither is it superfluous to recall that a number of its provisions are based on proposals put forward earlier by the United States itself. But, as is seen, reneging on earlier reached accords has become in general a norm of conduct for the present U.S. Administration.

In order to please big U.S. monopolies which seek unlimited access to the resources of the sea, the U.S. Administration is trying to undermine the convention and to impose the U.S. obstructionist approach to it upon other states as well. It is by no means fortuitous that the U.S. President's decisions have been announced at a time when a preparatory commission, which is considering practical questions of implementing the conventions provisions concerning utilization of seabed resources, has begun its work.

The actions by the present U.S. Administration are none other than an attempt at sowing chaos in matters aimed at using sea expanses and at undermining the foundations of mutually beneficial cooperation of countries in this vitally important area of human endeavor, which cannot be arouse serious concern among the majority of states. The Soviet Union shares this concern and together with other countries is firmly turning down the policy of arbitrariness which the United States would like to pursue in this field, too.

Neither can one fail to note that the United States, when seeking special, unfounded privileges in the world's oceans, at the same time is trying to substantiate its unlawful claims to trust island territories and respectively to the sea expanses around them which have long been conveted by U.S. monopolies.

Washington should be aware that its line of boycotting and undermining the new all-embracing UN Law of the Sea Convention and of taking arbitrary measures with regard to the seabed resources is at variance with the interests of the overwhelming majority of states and will meet with their resolute condemnation. The legal procedure set by the convention with regard to the regime of the sea expanses concerns all states. And no state, including the United States, can and should ignore that.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNTABLE'

LD241443 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0845 GMT 24 Apr 83

["International Observers Rountable" program with Vitaliy Vladimirovich Zhurkin, USA and Canada Institute deputy director; Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, international affairs journalist; and Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, All-Union Radio commentator]

Leninist Principles in Foreign Policy

[Text] [Levin] Good day, esteemed radio listeners! Lenin's behests, Lenin's ideas, are always a guiding star for us. And in the days when all progressive mankind is celebrating the anniversary of the birth of the founder of the Communist Party of our country and the Soviet state, we are of course paying particular attention to Vladimir Ilich's ideas. We check our course and set the route for progress by Lenin. Leninist ideas and Leninist principles are also the foundation of the Soviet state's foreign policy. And it is particularly apposite at the present time to recall that Vladimir Ilich repeatedly underlined that from the very beginning of the October Revolution the issue of foreign policy and international relations is the main one confronting us. At the 24th, 25th and 26th congresses, the CPSU drew up a peace program imbued with the Leninist principles of foreign policy, and defined the ways of implementing these in modern conditions. This peace program embodies the basic principles put forward by Vladimir Ilich Lenin: proletarian internationalism and peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems.

It is useful to recall here that the principle of proletarian internationalism was given qualitatively new expression with the formation of the world socialist system. In conformity with relations between the socialist states, proletarian internationalism appears in its highest form as socialist internationalism.

[Shishlin] One of Lenin's behests with regard to foreign policy -- a very clear one -- is that of open policy, honest policy. There are many very difficult problems in the world today, such as that of averting the threat of war, curtailing the arms race, overcoming crisis situations, and restructuring international economic relations -- and political relations, too -- on democratic principles. The Soviet Union truly occupies an open and honest position on all these problems, just as it does on all other problems. And this finds expression in quite specific things: for instance, the proposal to conclude an agreement on mutual nonuse of force and on maintaining peaceful relations between the NATO countries and the Warsaw Pact which was proposed at the session of the Political Consultative Committee held, as you recall, in Prague in January, and recently ratified at the meeting of the Warsaw Pact member-countries' foreign ministers in April: an open proposal, an honest one, without doubt. It appears that all sides would gain from acceptance of this proposal, and no one would lose. If one looks at the Western reaction, however, the point is that whereas in January we referred to certain encouraging responses when we spoke like this, today we must speak rather of somewhat disappointing responses.

[Zhurkin] Of course, Nikolay Vladimirovich, the Warsaw Pact member-states caught the United States unawares, to put it bluntly, with this proposal. At a time when the arms race was being whipped up and the situation was being aggravated by Washington, our side made a direct and honest proposal to reverse this process and to crush the process of aggravating the international situation initiated and carried on by imperialism. To start with, of course, Washington and some of its other NATO allies were taken unawares. Then, however, the routine diplomatic machine of the United States and NATO started operating. They began by trying to hush up this initiative by the socialist countries. Nothing came of it. Now they are trying to reduce it to nothing.

[Shishlin] Yes, basically they are avoiding discussion of the point at issue in this idea, although once again the Soviet Union and its friends are by no means taking up any firm stands: We are ready for dialogue and ready to listen to the NATO countries' ideas regarding the nature and form of such an agreement -- without, of course, losing sight of the basic idea in the process.

[Levin] I would like to recall that at the Political Consultative Committee's Prague session, a whole series of other extremely important proposals were put forward which also require a solution and to which we have so far received no reply. These proposals concern, after all, fundamental problems of modern international relations. For example, the socialist states propose that an agreement should be worked out as soon as possible on a total and all-embracing ban on nuclear weapons tests; that drawing up an international convention on banning and eliminating chemical weapons should be speeded up. Incidentally, the Americans talk a great deal about chemical weapons and are trying to create the impression that the Soviet Union is allegedly conducting a policy which demonstrates unwillingness to ban chemical weapons. Reproaches are even made against us alleging that the Soviet Union is using chemical weapons in Afghanistan, although not a single international commission which has visited Afghanistan has found any traces of use of this chemical weapon.

[Zhurkin] At the same time, however, Viktor Nikolayevich, the United States itself has taken a whole series of most dangerous decisions on developing new types of chemical weapons and the binary chemical weapon. That is one thing. And secondly, in first one and then another part of the globe terrorists or bandits like those in Afghanistan constantly use American chemical weapons in combat operations. And that is a fact; it has been proved.

[Levin] That is why, of course, our proposal, and I mean the socialist countries' proposal for speeding up the working out of an international convention banning and eliminating chemical weapons, is extremely topical and important. I do not wish to say, however, that other proposals are any less topical. For instance, it is also extremely important and urgent to draw up a convention banning neutron weapons. Negotiations on banning deployment of any type of weapons in space should be started without delay. This proposal was put foward in January. It was after this that Reagan came out with an idea in direct contradiction to this.

[Shishlin] This is fraught with a truly terrible threat for the world, this whole idea of the United States, acquiring some kind of solid and impenetrable shield. Well, the shield will in one way or another turn out to be full of holes. That is quite clear. The expenditure on it will be real, however, and the danger will be real, too.

[Zhurkin] Furthermore, the danger will also consist in the fact that the strategic situation will be very greatly destabilized. It should be said that the Reagan administration has recently been trying to dress up all its rather sinister ideas in an attractive package. Reagan comes out with a speech saying "let's strengthen defense in the strategic sphere." Well now, the uninitiated might well ask what is wrong with that -- instead of increasing offensive weapons, stepping up defense. Ten years ago there was a discussion going on the United States itself about antimissile defense systems, during which it was clearly and precisely stated that this defense is part of a system of first-strike measures, because a country which inflicts the first strike against another country hopes to protect itself with its antimissile defense system against a retaliatory, weakened strike from the opposing side. The word defense is very deceptive here. And, of course such actions -- if the United States continues along this path -- will destabilize the strategic situation.

Madrid Meeting, European Security

[Levin] The fact that the United States and its closest NATO partners are shrinking away from discussing the proposals put forward by the socialist states at the Prague session of the Political Consultative Committee is, it seems to me, very symptomatic. It very clearly demonstrates that the United States does not want constructive dialogue; the United States does not want an agreement. And this can be illustrated by another example. In Madrid this week representatives of states participating in the all-European conference resumed their work. The Madrid meeting has already been working for a very long time.

[Zhurkin] Since the autumn of 1980.

[Levin] Quite enough time to adopt some sort of decision. And the basis for such a decision is now taking shape. This is the revised draft of the neutral and nonaligned states. Incidentally, six such states -- Austria, Finland, Yugoslavia, San Marino, Sweden and Cyprus -- issued a statement just before the Madrid meeting resumed in which they stressed the need for the meeting to be brought to a positive conclusion as radidly as possible, since delaying it further could lead to erosion of the founding goals and tasks of the conference.

[Zhurkin] Not everything in this document of course, suits the socialist countries, and our side will indeed make certain stipulations.

This, however, is the principled essence of the socialist countries' approach: If something is not satisfactory, then one should try to discuss it and come to agreement or find a compromise solution. The positive idea itself, however, receives the full support of our side.

[Shishlin] Yes, and the American representative asserts that the main question that worries the United States, and this is naturally the question of human rights, is not adequately reflected in the draft prepared by the neutral and nonaligned countries. It has to be said that this draft of the neutral and nonaligned countries -- it has of course, already been said quite correctly -- is not entirely to our liking; not everything is perfect there. Certainly, many major ideas and considerations of the socialist countries have not been taken into consideration, but nevertheless it can be said that this draft is based upon the Helsinki Final Act.

[Zhurkin] Without a doubt.

[Shishlin] And that being so, there is course, a possibility of reaching agreement.

[Levin] In this connection I would like to say that many West European states also consider their revised draft to be a basis for discussions.

[Shishlin] Let me give this example: Kohl, the West German chancellor -- he apparently holds a somewhat different point of view from that of official Washington -- at least from these statements which he has made makes it look as though West Germany -- and to some extent it reflects the point of view in general in Western Europe -- is inclined to approach the draft of the neutral and nonaligned as a basis upon which the Madrid meeting can be rapidly completed having taken the decision in principle to convene a conference on confidence measures and disarmament in Europe.

[Levin] But, as can be judged from reports which are coming in, the United States is twisting the arms of its West European partners, trying to make them reject this basis. That is to say, in brief, the United States is saying that it is allegedly necessary to begin again from the beginning. What does this indicate? Only the lack of desire to achieve positive results at the Madrid meeting. That is how I understand it.

[Zhurkin] But in general this has been the policy of the United States from the very beginning of the Madrid meeting. They have literally been trying to torpedo it from the very first day, and had it not been for the resistance of other participants, perhaps they would have torpedoed it. What's more, this raises the question of the U.S. attitude toward the Helsinki document. Does it have an honest attitude towards this document, or is it also trying to undermine it? This is a major political question.

[Levin] They demagogically say that they are in favor of the concluding document, and very many different voices resound on this subject in the United States. But in practice, of course they undermine the basis principles.

[Shishlin] Since we have mentioned it, there is no denying that the present U.S. Administration has a consistent line, but this line is a dishonorable one, because words are indeed uttered about peace, about an interest in peace, words are spoken about defense; but, in fact, it pursues a truly imperial and aggressive course, and this course is implemented consistenly whether one is talking about problems of curtailing and limiting the arms race, whether one is talking about problems of European security, whether one is going to be talking about the settlement of existing crisis situations. This is a bad consistency.

[Levin] This same imperial consistency is also displayed in the U.S. approach to the use of the oceans and their wealth. The statement of the Soviet Government in connection with the U.S. policy on this question is published in the newspapers today, and this statement stresses with complete veracity that the actions of the present U.S. Administration are nothing more than an attempt to sow chaos on questions concerning the use of the expanses of the sea and to undermine the basis of mutually advantageous cooperation between countries in this vitally important field of human activity. This cannot fail to give rise to serious concern on the part of most states. The Soviet Union says the Soviet Government statement, shares this concern and together with other countries resolutely declines the policy of arbitrariness which the United States would like to carry out in this field.

U.S. 'Window of Vulnerability'

[Zhurkin] In regard to the U.S. approach to truly central questions, questions of war and peace, this week literally has again shown where official Washington is moving. The results were announced of the deliberating of the committee headed by General Brent Scowcroft which was charged with mapping out the path for the further development of U.S. strategic forces, and there was the statement by President Reagan which in essence supported the conclusions of this committee. What kind of conclusions were they? There is the installation of 100 MX intercontinental ballistic missiles, which essentially all specialists in the United States have admitted are first-strike weapons; there is the stake upon the deployment of antimissile defenses, essentially in violation of the treaty on antimissile defense, part of the SALT II documents; and a whole range of others. One might also recall other decisions for the development of new submarines and the deployment of cruise missiles, not to mention such a very dangerous and provocative step as the commencement of the deployment of new medium-range American missiles in Europe which is being planned for December of this year.

[Shishlin] In connection with the commencement of the deployment of these U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe, as is known, Washington has put forward the idea of an interim solution. A great deal has already been spoken about it and at the most authoritative level in our country. Essentially it is worth reminding listeners that of itself the U.S. plan and the NATO plan -- we will not place responsibility for this situation upon the United States alone -- is intended for a 5-year period. Any figure, therefore, that the United States might give in talks with the Soviet Union, any figure -- or more precisely, from any such figure they might go further. That is to say, they might name some low threshold, already deploy and install the missiles and then over the 5-year period build them up, for we see very well indeed that the United States is able to drag things out in talks and is able to block talks.

[Levin] In connection with the proposals for the deployment of the MX missiles I would like to draw attention to the following point of detail. It is detail, of course, but it describes in a very clear way the propaganda methods with which the ruling circles of the United States are trying to provide a foundation for their policy. When, at the very beginning, Reagan -- Reagan, already, after Carter -- put forward the idea of deploying MX missiles, the foundation for this was the so-called theory of the existence of a window of vulerability. Now the Scowcroft committee has come to the conclusion that in general there is no window of vulerability.

In this connection Jeremy Stone, director of the Federation of American Scientists, observed in a way that seemed to me to be very venomous that it looks as though a window of vulnerability can be opened and closed according to need. Indeed, the Americans do launch one propaganda campaign and then another in substantiation of their militarist plans. They change the propaganda theses with an extraordinary ease. If one puts all this together one gets a muddle which no one can sort out, though the aim in this always remains one and the same: to achieve a new twist to the arms race.

[Zhurkin] What you get is not a window of vulnerability but some kind of tottering structure which leans first to one side and then the other.

[Levin] Quite right. The aim of the United States remains the same: to achieve military superiority and to turn the screw of the arms race as a method of achieving this selfsame military superiority. Here it must be said directly that the interests of the United States are a long way from coinciding with the interests of Western Europe. In Western Europe realistic voices are being heard quite loudly, although these voices are not yet perhaps authoritative enough to halt the pressure from the United States. But the West Europeans understand perfectly the possible consequences of these plans.

U.S., West Europe Relations

[Shishlin] Unfortunately, you are right when you speak of the point of view of the broad public but alas we cannot attribute or ascribe this position to the ruling circles of the West European states.

[Levin] This, of course, is true.

[Shishlin] Here I want to quote the position of the French Government in the first place. There was a time when France in many respects held a position in the vanguard where detente in Europe and throughout the world was concerned. Now the French have one position. The French hold on to their so-called independent nuclear missile systems.

[Zhurkin] They have not undertaken a new extensive program for expanding these resources.

[Shishlin] Yes. In addition to this they are voting with both their hands for the U.S. missiles in Europe.

[Levin] But Jospin, secretary of the French Socialist Party, sang in the same key in which Reagan himself, if you please, sings on this issue.

[Zhurkin] Of course, these questions of economic, political and, to some extent, military relations between the United States and Western Europe will be examined first and foremost during the preparations for the meeting of the seven leading capitalist powers which will take place at the end of this May in the little American town of Williamsburg. The preparations for the meeting are in progress. The meeting will probably, in fact, not be an easy one -- you may remember the same sort of meetings in Ottawa or the latest one last year in Versailles -- and the United States will, of course, try to twist the arms of its partners. In this it will succeed, as the example of France shows. In any case, there will, of course, be a struggle at the meeting. In this context what Lenin said about the contradictions within imperialism and the extremely bitter fighting that is waged among the imperialist giants rings particularly true.

[Shishlin] In this connection it is interesting that the recent visit by West German Chancellor Kohl to the United States was apparently marked by a complete coincidence of views between official Bonn and official Washington on the missile business. As far as economic problems are concerned, Kohl evidently prides himself on having somewhat restrained Reagan's passion to organize some sort of East-West economic and trade war. In any case, it seems that there is some sort of understanding between the West German chancellor and the U.S. President that these problems will not be discussed specifically at Williamsburg, since the West Europeans have a different attitude from that of the United States toward trade links with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

As regards the intentions of the U.S. Administration, I am afraid that it has no inclination to abandon its aims. Perhaps as a tactical ruse it will not speak extensively on the matter at Williamsburg, but we know full well that it is trying to extend infinitely the list of so-called "strategic goods" whose export to the socialist countries is banned. It is clear, however, that they will probably not say anything about this at Williamsburg. But wherever they decide to meet the next time, there will be a discussion about this, and by that time they will attempt to channel things in that direction.

U.S. Policy in Central America

[Levin] All in all, of course, present U.S. policy is noteworthy not only for its imperial ambitions, not only for its hegemonist aspirations, but also for the fact that the most direct methods are used to implement that policy. Again this is illustrated by the events that are taking place in Central America.

The American magazine NEWSWEEK published an interview with Nicaraguan Foreign Minister D'Escoto. The first question asked by the American magazine went like this: "What part is the United States playing in the military action in Nicaragua?" The reply was clear and precise. At present the United States is waging a war against Nicaragua, although this war has not been officially declared. Nevertheless, it is a war, although the Reagan administration has been able to get round Congress by calling its activities "intelligence operations." It is an American war, although in it the United States is primarily using former members of the Somozist National Guard.

[Zhurkin] And if you look around, Viktor Nikolayevich, this sort of undeclared war by the United States has literally assumed a classic form. There is one against Nicaragua, another against Afghanistan and yet another, waged chiefly by the hands of South Africa, against Angola. And they are absolutely all the same. Counterrevolutionary rabble who have escaped from those countries are gathered together, armed and trained by the Americans or their allies, then sent back into those countries to carry out all sorts of sabotage, subversion and terrorist activities.

[Shishlin] If my memory serves me correctly, President Reagan asserted at one of his press conferences that the United States is not aiming to overthrow the Nicaraguan Government, but wants Nicaraguan opposition groups to take part in the government. And this is the sort of cynicism that the President is amusing himself with!

[Levin] Yes, he did say something like that, but in addition to the statements a specific policy is being pursued. This week Secretary of State Shultz paid a visit to Mexico. In many respects its was a noteworthy visit. First of all, it was noted that Shultz took with him two other secretaries representing the upper echelon of the U.S. Administration; these were Regan, the secretary of the treasury, and Baldrige, the secretary of commerce. The primary topic of discussion was the policy toward Central America, on which the attitudes of Mexico and the United States diverge sharply in diametrically opposite directions. And the fact that this delegation included Regan, the treasury secretary, leads me to think that they apparently intended to buy off Mexico. After all, Mexico is in economic difficulties, in debt to the tune of $80 billion -- quite a considerable sum. Its stance regarding Central America is as follows: no foreign interference and problems to be solved by political means. Mexico is in favor of talks between Nicaragua and Honduras. Incidentally, the Nicaraguan Government has also expressed the same attitude on more than one occasion. Mexico comes out in support of Cuba, which is yet another bone sticking in the throat of the present Washington administration. However, as it turns out, nothing came of Shultz' visit; Mexico stood by its position.

[Shishlin] Viktor Nikolayevich, in general the U.S. Administration does not read the history book the same way we do. They turn the pages, starting with the present, but keep turning all the time to the past.

But if we look at what has been happening in Central America and the Caribbean, then no matter how hard the United States tries to go back to the times of Theodore Roosevelt, and so forth, it doesn't work. The realities of life -- social progress and the power of social progress -- are truly insuperable.

[Zhurkin] And not only in Central America, but throughout the whole world, too.

[Levin] This week, incidentally, was the anniversary of the routing of the interventionist forces at the Bay of Pigs, and intervention which was instigated by the United States. The lesson of the Bay of Pigs has apparently not been learned properly by the United States, but, as they say in such cases, that's just so much the worse for them.

[Shishlin] We can, though, end our review of current international affairs on an optimistic note. Despite all these very complex twists and turns, these complex problems which do not lend themselves to simple solutions, the cause of peace, the cause of social progress, the cause of democracy and freedom of the people cannot be quashed by Reagan or by others like him. They are being resolved on the basis of the objective laws of history.

[Levin] Vladimir Ilich Lenin said: "We promise the workers and peasants that we will do everything we can for peace, and we will do this." This was Lenin's behest, and Lenin had another behest which said that a revolution that cannot defend itself is worth nothing. The socialist revolution has assimilated this thoroughly, and when Comrade Andropov said in his replies to questions put by RUDE PRAVO after the Prague meeting of the Political Consultative Committee that the international position of the socialist community remains firm and reliable, this was a reflection of all those positive points and factors that we have been talking about. And this is yet further confirmation of the triumph of Lenin's ideas. Here our program ends. Thank you, dear comrades, for listening, and goodbye.

MOSCOW TV'S 23 APRIL 'STUDIO 9' PROGRAM

OW240454 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 0731 GMT 23 Apr 83

["Studio 9" program moderated by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Soviet television and radio, with Leonid Mitrofanovich Zamyatin, chief of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello, comrades, we are meeting with you today in Studio 9 of the Ostankino Television Center for our monthly program devoted to topical problems of world politics. Many of your letters have recently accumulated in the vast mail of Studio 9 containing interesting and the most diverse questions on the course of Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva and the so-called new U.S. proposals at these talks, on the domestic and foreign policy course of the current French Government, on the election in the FRG and Bonn's policies after these elections, on the state of Soviet-Chinese relations, on the situation in Albania, the Iran-Iraq war and many other questions that deserve to be discussed. Therefore, we have decided to specially devote today's Studio 9 program to replies to your letters and questions, and have asked Leonid Mitrofanovich Zamyatin, chief of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee, to do this.

U.S. Interim Solution Discussed

To make our work easier, I have sorted the letters according to topic and would like to begin today's talk with the letters whose authors ask us to explain the interim solution now proposed by Washington at the talks following the so-called zero option and how this interim solution differs from Washington's original proposals.

The Kulishovs, engineers from Khabarovsk; Comrade Abdulkhakov from Groznyy; Vera Stepanovna Belova, a teacher from Kalinin Oblast; and many others among our television viewers have asked us to discuss this. Leonid Mitrofanovich, I think we will begin by replying to these comrades.

[Zamyatin] As you know, the question of the reduction of intermediate-range nuclear assets is being discussed in Geneva. At the present time, no results have been achieved at these talks. They have been brought to an impasse by the Americans and to somehow cover up this U.S. position, essentially a position of sabotaging the talks, the Americans by manipulating public opinion, introduced the concept of the so-called Reagan zero option in their proposals.

What is the essence of this Reagan zero option? Essentially, it differs from the universal concept of zero that is generally accepted in mathematics. The calculation here is made in such a way that all forward-based assets, which include U.S. aircraft capable of carrying nuclear weapons a distance greater than 1,000 kilometers, U.S. aircraft deployed on aircraft carriers, missiles deployed on submarines, and British and French missiles, remain intact. Reagan puts all of this aside and proposes discussing, as he formulated it in his position, to discuss everything from zero: The Soviet Union would eliminate all of its missiles and, in this event, the United States would not deploy the proposed Pershing missiles on West European territory.

However, since there is now an arms parity between the United States, France and Great Britain on one side and the Soviet Union on the other in intermediate-range weapons, then naturally according to this formulation of the question the Soviet Union will be left with zero and the Americans and the NATO forces will have at their disposal the 1,000 units that they strive to leave intact. This position was quite clearly unacceptable and even U.S. NATO allies turned to the United States urging Reagan to show some flexibility. Thus, to show the unique flexibility of the U.S. Administration, a new proposal was put forward at the talks, the so-called interim solution. Interim between what and what? Interim between the fact that the United States has not yet deployed its weapons in Europe but wants to deploy them. Therefore, they again propose to leave all of the components which comprise NATO forward-based assets intact at 1,000 units and to engage in a reduction of Soviet missiles. In other words, we are in fact once again talking about the deployment of U.S. missiles in installments, instead of all 600 units at once as they formerly declared. This installment is what they propose to reach agreement on with the Soviet Union. They want to cut us back and at the same time deploy their own missiles. This is where the manipulation lies.

[Zorin] In other words, this interim solution and its proposal is not so much a real search for mutually acceptable solutions as it is propaganda.

[Zamyatin] This is a manipulation of figures aimed at giving the Americans an opportunity to deploy their intermediate-range weapons in Europe and to try and bring down the wave of protests which is now spreading on a broad front in all European countries, while at the same time emphasizing that this is an agreement in Geneva and that such weighty agreements will give them an opportunity to deploy a certain number of missiles.

European Interests in Arms Talks

[Zorin] Incidentally, Leonid Mitrofanovich, insofar as we have mentioned this issue, we have several letters in our mail on this very topic. Dmitriy Aleksandrovich Zebrin, an engineer from Krasnodar, Comrade Flegontov from (Lukty) village in the Komi ASSR, and several others ask: Why are we conducting talks with the United States on intermediate-range missiles, an issue related to the situation in Europe, and not with the governments of the West European countries?

[Zamyatin] Because when the NATO countries were adopting that notorious dual decision in 1979, they decided to empower the United States to conduct these talks with the Soviet Union. Therefore, the United States is conducting them. However, when the other NATO countries are discussed, the United States pretends that it has no intention of discussing these issues.

[Zorin] I understand. You have mentioned U.S. assets which Reagan does not wish to take into consideration and include in the zero option, and, while mentioning this, you also spoke of the nuclear missile potential of Britain and France. A lot of controversy surrounds this, that is, whether to take this into consideration. Washington says do not take it into consideration...

[Zamyatin] In reality, it exists. How can it not be considered?

[Zorin] It exists. In connection with this I would like to refer to a document which we have just received. The French Government has approved a draft law entitled: Military Program for the 1984-88 Period. Comrades, I would simply like to cite a small part of the document. When it discusses the reorganization and rearmament of conventional forces, the draft law points out that the capability of the armed forces to defend French territory must be ensured, as well as their ability to conduct combat operations alongside their allies in Europe in accordance with government directives and to continue decisive operations beyond European borders.

[Zamyatin] This precisely confirms our thesis that we have repeatedly declared, including at the Geneva talks, concerning the fact that British and French missiles must be taken into account in the general total because they are aimed against the Soviet Union. This is confirmed by this (?statement)...

[Zorin] Yes, and this is no longer a newspaper article but a draft law, an official document.

[Zamyatin] That is correct.

U.S. Economic Pressure on France

[Zorin] Now, insofar as we have begun talking about France, I would like you to reply to Vladimir Vikentyevich Golovinskiy from Leningrad who writes in his letter: The shift to the right in France, where the government apparatus is in the hands of leftist forces, is completely incomprehensible. What is the matter here?

[Zamyatin] The matter here is that recently the United States has attempted to use, first of all, the lever of economic pressure on its NATO allies and on France. It is this economic pressure which has caused many governments on NATO's right flank, such as the FRG and others, to draw increasingly closer to those concepts which the United States is trying to dictate in Europe.

The same process is occurring in France. As a result of sharp U.S. economic pressure, France has been forced to draw closer to a pro-Atlantic position on all questions. If we take France's economy and show this mechanism of U.S. pressure on it then it would be sufficient to note that the Americans are now forcing the European countries to alter the exchange rate of their currencies in order to withstand the U.S. pressure and competition. As you know, France recently devalued the franc three times. The FRG has revalued, in other words, increased the cost of the mark, four times. This has given the United States an opportunity to create a situation in which a lot of capital has flowed out of France, out of French and FRG banks, because of high bank interest rates on the dollar. For example, in 1 year alone France lost Fr63 billion through capital outflow. The French state deficit now amounts to about Fr310 billion a year and has doubled compared to last year.

At present, France is being forced to adopt a whole series of economic measures, including requests for loans from the United States. But the United States gives nothing for free. So France requested that it be granted 4 billion [currency not specified] and the United States immediately imposed its political conditions.

This is interesting. Preparations are presently underway for a conference in the city of Williamsburg, on the U.S. east coast. A series of economic questions will be discussed there concerning U.S. relations with West Europe. What does the United States want to organize here? First of all, since it is pursuing this economic pressure on France, it wants to continue it, particularly in connection with the relations of these countries with the Soviet Union. It wants to introduce embargoes, to interrupt the policy of financial credits extended to the Soviet Union by Western countries, and a series of other measures.

But what is interesting is that many countries are already saying, preliminarily, that they would like to discuss the situation in West Europe in general at this conference, and not only this problem, as well as the situation in the United States and its economic relations with West Europe because this situation is most alarming for West Europe. Take France, for example, where there are 2 million unemployed and even more people may lose their jobs.

This process of U.S. pressure also affects French policy and its political orientation. Hence, the many French actions. They are seeking clarification of their own position; rather, they know their position and they search for an explanation precisely with this in mind [oni ishchut, tak skazat, svoi korni, tochneye oni imeyut svoi korni i ishchut svoyego obyasneniya imenno v etom].

Soviet Nonuse of Nuclear Arms

[Zorin] And now another question from a different sphere. Here is a letter from physician Ilina of Kharkov. I think it is an interesting question. At any rate, no other letter in the mail contains this question: As you know, the United States did not follow the example of the Soviet Union: It did not make a pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Taking this into consideration, the question arises, as I understand it, are we not damaging the security of the Soviet Union as long as our pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons remains in force?

[Zamyatin] Indeed we made a pledge, a unilateral pledge, not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union must take all measures to prevent a nuclear war. If other nuclear powers followed our example and made such pledges unilaterally, then there would no no first strike or second strike. This is quite clear. The letter, though, correctly points out that the Western states did not respond to the Soviet Union's initiative with unilateral actions of their own and they did not make any such pledges.

The comrade is concerned about whether or not we are damaging our country's security. No, we are not damaging our security because if some madman in the West resorts to nuclear weapons and pushes the nuclear button, this strike would not go without retaliation. We have what we need to defend our country, and our leaders have repeatedly spoken about this in their addresses.

Soviet Military Threat 'Campaign'

[Zorin] Another group of letters contain the following question: The Reagan government and its West European allies apparently would not be able to implement their current dangerous course -- people understand that it is dangerous and not only dangerous but also very expensive; you know that U.S. and West European taxpayers pay for this arms race -- the comrades ask:

If this course were universally rejected, then Western governments probably would not be able to implement it. Since they are implementing it they must be receiving some support from a certain segment of their countries' population. And the comrades who ask us these questions understand that this is connected with a campaign about a Soviet military threat, a campaign which is being pursued intensively. The question is, where does this fear in a certain segment of the population of both the United States and West Europe, this completely groundless fear...

[Zamyatin -- interrupting] I understand the question.

[Zorin -- continuing] ...of the Soviet Union, come from?

[Zamyatin] Because when Reagan came to the White House, he came with quite definite aims of unleashing the arms race, primarily in nuclear missiles, because Reagan's appearance in the White House should be identified with the fact that he primarily represents nuclear missile interests from the U.S. west coast. The creation of a certain propaganda campaign that would somehow explain his action and activities to the public was included in his plans to intensify, sharply intensify, the arms race.

Reagan paid a great deal of attention to this, and a concept immediately appeared that everything the U.S. Administration is doing is being done to repel the Soviet military threat. Falsification began of various figures which showed Soviet superiority, so to speak, in various types of weapons. Besides, they often resorted to fraud, because different approaches exist to the armament of this or that state. This was left out of the calculations and only figures which were advantageous to this completely false propaganda against the Soviet Union were used. It was cranked out by the massive U.S. propaganda machine and continues to be cranked out.

However, this was not enough because the size of the antiwar movement showed that people do not believe many of the assertions advanced by the White House. Primarily, people wish to preserve the most precious thing of all -- human life on earth; and they oppose this militarization policy.

Reagan then began to intensify his propaganda pressure, together with the arms race, naturally. A series of other assertions appeared in this propaganda campaign. Reagan now appears every Saturday in his television press conference, which are not improvised, as their texts are all written beforehand by the people who surround him -- the so-called gang of four. Furthermore, Reagan now arranges addresses before individual groups of journalists. Why? In order to again prove the thesis that the Russians have an advantage and therefore the United States must quickly acquire additional arms. Weinberger declared directly the other day: We must first of all have military superiority to defend peace. So there you have the concept. But those who do not know Soviet policies and who do not know the real facts about our foreign policy -- and unfortunately there are many people like this in the United States because U.S. propaganda does everything to distort our viewpoint and our arguments and to crush public opinion with its false propaganda which is conducted particularly by the White House -- [believe in] this concept. We have often described this in detail in our press.

And so, a certain segment of U.S. public opinion is enveloped by a feeling of chauvinism, it is enveloped by this slogan which Reagan proclaimed at the very beginning when he entered the White House, namely to ensure the greatness of the United States, its superiority and so on. This chauvinism continues to play a role in U.S. public opinion and a certain segment of the American public supports Reagan's policies. This cannot be ignored.

At the same time, however, there is also a certain segment of the U.S. public that understands where this arms race can lead. It adheres to a practical position and, it primarily favors an arms freeze.

This question remains on the agenda in the United States. It is now under discussion by the U.S. Congress, and many congressmen support this decision. Reagan, on the other hand, is literally struggling like a fanatic in order to ratify military programs and in order to conduct an insane arms race.

[Zorin] Indeed you are right, he has apparently frightened a certain segment of the American public because the kind of antiwar movement taking place in the United States has perhaps never occured there before. So, one should see both sides of the matter: the fact that a certain segment of the public has been deluded as well as the fact that a certain considerable segment of the previously politically passive public is now actively coming forward.

[Zamyatin] This is true.

[Zorin] Leonid Mitrofanovich, you have already drawn attention to a charecteristic peculiarity, namely that the U.S. President is playing an unusually active personal role -- unusual in Washington political practice -- in this propaganda campaign. This never happened before.

[Zamyatin] Although it had never happened, nonetheless in representing the White House point of view he is taking a lot onto himself. He is trying to convince Congress that he requires additional appropriations. You know the budget is already $280 billion. By 1987 the total U.S. military appropriations for the previous 5 years will reach $1.6 trillion. He extorts this money from Congress while the profits of military monopolies, particularly missile interests, are now two to four times higher than the profits of other interests. This is where the money is being channeled.

U.S. Defensive Weapons Plan

[Zorin] The next group of letters to which I would like to turn our attention is connected with the program recently proclaimed by President Reagan regarding the creation of fundamentally new types of weapons which he called defensive weapons. Our television viewers ask first of all, what kind of weapons are they, are they really defensive, and what is the position of the Soviet Union on this?

[Zamyatin] Valentin Sergeyevich, these are not defensive weapons. This is just another screen for the arms race process underway in the United States. Defensive is just the terminology being used. I will cite just one example: In 1972 when the Soviet-U.S. agreement on the limitation of antimissile defensive systems was signed, a temporary agreement on strategic weapons was signed at the same time. These are interrelated systems and they can in no way be separated.

Reagan is now saying that at the same time, so to speak, as he is strengthening strategic weapons -- and this fact is confirmed by the circumstances that a few days ago he adopted the program of a committee which was headed by General Scowcroft and which included all past U.S. secretaries of defense alive today. [sentence as heard] They confirmed that the MX program should be implemented. What is this: a defensive program? No, an offensive one! Every MX missile, of which 100 will be deployed, carries 10 warheads. If we take as a starting figure that each warhead carries 100 kilotons of nuclear charge, then this means that each missile carries 1 megaton of nuclear charge. If we imagine this from the point of view of its killing or destructive power, it is equivalent to approximately a train 600 kilometers long crammed with conventional explosives.

[Zorin] Six hundred kilometers?

[Zamyatin] Six hundred kilometers. This is the destructive power....

[Zorin -- interrupting] Of one.

[Zamyatin -- continuing] ...of one MX missile. Yet 100 of them are being deployed. Is this a defensive system? Of course not.

He decided to deploy a new generation of missiles, the so-called Midget missiles this was also announced in recent days. And now he is talking about this defensive system. At present all sorts of conjectures are circulating about how it will be implemented. But one thing is clear from everything published in the U.S. press. Namely, that Reagan intends to transfer the arms race to outer space in order to implement this new system, this so-called defensive system. In other words, as one scientist explained, to launch into space about 12 satellites that could strike weapons heading for the United States with their beams. However, you know that satellites of enormous mass and size would have to be deployed around the globe over Soviet territory. In other words, the arms race is already being transferred to outer space.

I think that this is really camouflage, and that yet another strategic weapons system is being planned, but they are calling it defensive.

USSR-U.S. Relations

[Zorin] Thank you. From what you said in answering the previous questions, of course, a not very rosy picture of present Soviet-U.S. relations appears. I say this because many of our television viewers, in particular Comrade Korkin from Kostroma Oblast, and many others note in their letters that Soviet-U.S. relations at present are distinguished by great tension and they ask: Well, is a real improvement in them possible in the foreseeable future, or not?

[Zamyatin] It is difficult to expect this with the present state of Reagan's policies. One should take into consideration the fact that the Reagan administration must approach the solution of international problems differently if it really wants to improve relations with the Soviet Union. Everything now boils down to one thing: It is impossible to hold talks through the use of force as a lever of pressure on the Soviet Union or to seek the solution of questions from a position of force.

U.S. Elections, Foreign Policy

[Zorin] Leonid Mitrofanovich, here is another question which interests many people. You know that the election campaign in the United States always greatly influences the government's course. A point comes when the President begins thinking more about the election results rather than about his policies. U.S. elections are approaching, although strictly speaking they will be held in the fall of next year. Nevertheless, one may say that the election campaign has begun. In this regard, I would like you to express your opinion on two questions. First, in your personal opinion -- I also study the United States and understand that different specialists can have different viewpoints -- will Reagan run for a second term, or not? This is one question, I would like to pose both at once. Second, will the election campaign affect Washington's foreign policy course as the elections draw nearer and how will it affect it?

[Zamyatin] I will begin my reply by saying that the Democratic Party has already begun an active election campaign. A number of people have already announced their candidacies for the party nomination. So far preference is being given to Mondale, former vice president in the Carter administration. However, other names are also being officially cited. In particular, former U.S. astronaut Glenn, who is now a senator, has announced his candidacy. Other figures are seeking nomination. I will not take up time now by listing all the names. Regarding your first question on whether Reagan will run, I think, and this is my personal opinion, that this will depend to a great extent on two factors. The first is the economic situation in the country. When he was on his way to the White House he promised people manna from heaven. However, in reality Reaganomics is now bogged down on all sides, 12 million people are unemployed and the enormous U.S. economic slump is a factor affecting both the common people and those who promoted Reagan, the banking and financial circles who usually financially support the election campaign. Nobody gets elected anywhere in the United States without money, big money.

[Zorin] Now they are suffering losses through many of the government's measures.

[Zamyatin] They are suffering losses, with the exception of the California military-industrial complex which we mentioned earlier.

Your second question, will the approach of the election campaign affect Reagan's policies? Yes, unquestionably because he will now encounter directly not only the promises he gave but also a definite program that had to be implemented. The foreign policy question will not play a small role here, and in particular, I am convinced that Soviet-U.S. relations will become the center of attention in the U.S. election campaign. Why? Because regardless of whether the voter is informed or poorly informed, if he senses that this administration is leading to a possible confrontation, to a possible clash with one of the great powers, which the Soviet Union is, then he will think twice about giving his vote to such a candidate.

A third question is whether he is capable of conducting foreign policy or not. At present, U.S. foreign policy itself shows signs of considerable impudence with regard to relations with allies and with those states with which Reagan must conduct and build relations. It is impossible to coexist in the world without such relations.

FRG Election Outcome

[Zorin] Let us turn to the European Continent and reply to the letters of many comrades who ask the same question. Valentin Aleksandrovich Samsonov from Maykop, Aleksandr Fedorovich Kazachenko from Moscow, Comrade Fedorov, a war veteran from Lvov, Comrade Gurnov from Moscow and many other television viewers ask about the election results in the FRG. They ask: Everyone knows that in this country, as in many others, the antiwar movement and the movement against U.S. missile deployment has acquired a lot of power. Our television viewers are well aware of these facts and they ask the question: In view of this public sentiment, how was it possible for the rightist bloc to come to power when its leaders often go along with the policies of Washington, which is preparing to deploy missiles in West Europe, particularly on West German territory, as early as this year? How can this election outcome be explained?

[Zamyatin] My opinion is that Kohl's party chose improvement of the economy as its election slogan. It took advantage of the fact that the FRG's economy is in an extremely difficult situation, in about the same condition as we noted in France today. This is why tbe slogan of improving the economy and laying the entire blame for the FRG's economic difficulties on the bloc of Social Democrats and Free Democrats gave this party an opportunity to gain the majority at the elections.

The limitation or nondeployment of U.S. nuclear weapons slogan also was a factor in the FRG elections but the Social Democratic Party failed to emphasize it properly while Kohl's party used it as a symbol of adherence to NATO ideas and ideas of acquiring additional arms. It interpreted its as follows: If the talks in Geneva fail then nothing would remain but to accept U.S. arms.

But to say that the demand not to deploy nuclear weapons in the FRG was not keenly manifested during the election campaign would be incorrect, because the nondeployment of nuclear weapons slogan was used to the utmost by the Green Party, a completely new party on the FRG scene. By preaching and proclaiming this slogan it received 27 seats, or 5.6 percent of all votes in the FRG.

[Zorin] Leonid Mitrofanovich, I was just about to ask you to respond to many of our television viewers who ask what kind of a party it is.

[Zamyatin] I would say that basically it is made up of intellectuals 25 to 30 years old who for many years promoted the defense and protection of the environment in the FRG. This is why it is called the Green Party. However...

[Zorin] But this does not appear to be a political...

[Zamyatin] However, it is political, so to speak, because they struggled to protect the environment from the construction of atomic power stations and the deployment of any kind or form of nuclear weapon, and during the election campaign they very sharply opposed the deployment of U.S. weapons in the FRG, both existing ones as well as intermediate-range weapons. This primarily concerns the 108 Pershing missiles which we are discussing.

[Zorin] They have entered big-time politics.

[Zamyatin] They have entered big-time politics. The leaders of this party are retired General Batian, who pursues a policy of struggle against nuclear arms and U.S. missile deployment in the FRG, and a woman named Petra Kelly, who is also an active supporter of this policy. Overall, the base of this party includes about 300,000 people, but it is growing. This is what I can say at present.

[Zorin] Yes, judging by the number of seats it received it is really influential. Leonid Mitrofanovich, to conclude this issue I would like you to express your opinion on the following: The supporters of disarmament, of a freeze and of nondeployment of missiles played a definite role in the FRG elections. Would you say that they will play a practical role in the future as well and exert influence on the current Bonn government?

[Zamyatin] They will and the resolve of many organizations, both established ones and newly emerging ones, is to preserve all living things on earth and to prevent the Americans from turning West Germany and all of Europe as a whole -- I mean West Europe -- into hostages of the reckless U.S. nuclear policy which is being pursued by the Reagan administration. This movement is expanding and it is an active movement. People understand that much now depends on their stand and on their votes.

[Zorin] Another thing in this connection, Leonid Mitrofanovich. In an attempt to somehow undermine their positions and to reduce their authority, a thesis is being intensively launched to the effect that the participants in these movements do not reflect the interests of their countries but are incited by the Soviet Union.

[Zamyatin] You know, I have heard many assertions of this kind and even read about them. I would like to cite an example which shows how absurd all of this is.

Reagan was once asked by journalists: Mr President, what is your attitude toward the movement against the nuclear arms race, which is presently growing the the United States? This was asked during a particular period when several hundred thousand people participated in mass demonstrations throughout the United States. Reagan just said: This is Moscow's handiwork. A journalist asked him: Mr President, how can you be so sure that this is Moscow's handiwork? He said: You know, I recently read about this in the U.S. READERS DIGEST magazine. So there you have a reply to everything at once.

[Zorin] Yes, quite an argument.

USSR-PRC Ties

[Zorin] Another group of letters: many of our television viewers are interested in the current state of Soviet-Chinese relations. What can you say about that?

[Zamyatin] Well, our television viewers know that two rounds of Soviet-Chinese consultations were held at the level of special government representatives to discuss a whole series of matters that could lead to normalizing relations between the Soviet Union and China. The position of our party and our state has always been and will remain that we must normalize those relations, that we should at least have good intergovernmental relations and thereby strengthen both the cause of peace and the cause of socialism. Those consultations will be continued; an agreement to that effect exists. The atmosphere in which the consultations were held was good and businesslike and both sides expressed satisfaction over that fact, including the Chinese leaders whose statements expressed an identical point of view. Matters, however, have not yet reached a point where major problems can be solved.

The talks are confidential and both sides have agreed not to reveal those issues specifically subject to discussion. Nonetheless, a pattern can be established from the Chinese press, that the Chinese side set certain preliminary conditions to normalizing relations between China and the Soviet Union. The preliminary conditions do not concern Soviet-Chinese relations but rather our relations with third countries.

In pursuing our policy we quite naturally never planned to pay a price for normalizing relations with any country, a price equivalent to changing the nature of our relations with other third countries with which the Soviet Union maintains relations. This is our principled policy.

We consider it to be a negative factor that despite the consultations Chinese propaganda continues to take a hostile line toward the Soviet Union. I would like to tell our television viewers that between 120 and 140 articles hostile to the Soviet Union appear every month in RENMIN RIBAO. They concern various aspects of Soviet foreign and domestic policies.

In the sphere of foreign policy the term Soviet globalism occurs as well as Soviet military threat, which has borrowed from imperialist propaganda, and so forth. That terminology also existed during the cultural revolution and generally, if we look at Beijing's propaganda, it has not changed now. It has always been a base on which the imperialist forces attempted to use China against the Soviet Union. And it is regrettable that the proposal we made to China about limiting propaganda of this kind, and not inculcating a feeling of alienation among the population, but on the contrary being guided by a feeling in internationalism, has not yet found any support among the Chinese leadership. That is a negative factor. Nevertheless, as Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov said at the November 1982 plenum, in the interests of peace and in the interests of socialism we must do everything in our countries' power to try and normalize our relations. This was and remains our party's line.

[Zorin] Another question in connection with that topic. Leonid Mitrofanovich, when one reads and analyses the statements of the American press and some of the more talkative Washington officials, one cannot shake off the feeling that any kind of improvement in Soviet-Chinese relations makes them very irritable, openly irritable. Now does this point to some specific plans linked with China that were worked out in Washington? Maybe they are still being (?worked out)?

[Zamyatin] Naturally in Reagan's politics we can expect this, that they would strive to use China as a factor working against the Soviet Union. Generally it fits in with their plans. But apparently it is primarily being done in U.S. plans to turn Chinese policy against the Soviet Union.

But there are already enough contradictions between the United States and China, and I think that China by no means plans to play the role proposed for it by Washington. It has its own policy, although we do not approve of many aspects of that policy.

In particular, exchanges of gunfire -- artillery exchanges -- are presently occurring on the Sino-Vietnamese border. This is a case of military pressure on Vietnam related to the Kampuchean problem, and so forth. In other words, all of this must really be subjected to a thorough study in order to make the correct conclusions. But our conclusion remains in force: -- the conclusion that imperialism is attempting to use any weakened link of socialism, weakened by internal policies or weakened by something else, against the Soviet Union.

USSR-Albanian Relations

[Zorin] I would now like you to reply to Comrade Bolonenko, an oil industry worker from Tyumen Oblast, who asks in his letter: What is the situation in Albania and is normalization of our relations with this country possible?

[Zamyatin] You know, we have very little information about Albania insofar as the policy pursued by Enver Hoxha is a unique autarkic one; in other words, a sort of isolation of the state from the rest of the world.

This policy has led to grave consequences for Albania itself. On a political level the Albanian leaders continue to hold positions hostile to the Soviet Union. They accuse the Soviet Union of globalism, imperialism and God knows what else. Although they are not as inventive as the United States in this, nonetheless, a lot is borrowed from the positions of the imperialist states in accusing the Soviet Union of practically preparing for a new war against other states and peoples. The Albanian leadership also lacks originality in this although -- I repeat -- the absence of links between Albania and the rest of the world -- it is mainly oriented now toward Italy and Turkey and to a lesser degree toward other Western countries in trade and economic relations -- causes great economic harm and creates difficulties in the lives of the Albanian people. But there are no signs that the Albanian leadership plans to alter its policy, and it is continuing this line.

Iran-Iraq War

[Zorin] In their letters to us some of our television viewers ask that we dwell on events relating to military activities and the war between Iran and Iraq and the course of these military activities and on how we view the prospects of this war and its influence on the situation in the region.

[Zamyatin] These two Mideast countries have been in a state of war for nearly 3 years now. The war is being waged owing to mutual territorial claims. The British colonizers knew how to do this. When they withdrew from a country they always left behind a bone of contention over borders; they left certain contentious territorial areas. Strictly speaking, this is what the war is all about, but it has already developed beyond a territorial war and has spawned feelings of enormous antagonism between the two states.

This war benefits neither these countries nor the Arab east as a whole. Why? Because it weakens the military potential of both Iran and Iraq. I will cite an example: On 15 April Iran carried out an offensive and seized a small piece of Iraqi territory facing Baghdad. After several days Iraq recovered this territory but the losses in this battle amounted to 4,500 men.

This war is costing both countries enormous casualties and our position -- like the position of many states in this region -- is to force Iran and Iraq to sit down at the conference table and have them set aside their antagonistic sentiments and attempt to solve this issue through peaceful means. Herein lies our position and the position of many Arab countries. So far such talks have yielded no results.

[Zorin] To conclude our program I would like you to answer a question from Antonia Ivanovna Kuleshova, a pediatrician from Leningrad, who writes: Recently, a worsening of the international situation can be observed. Will it continue to worsen or are there still prospects for an improvement?

[Zamyatin] As we have already mentioned in this program the U.S. Administration is presently pursuing a very perfidious course, a dangerous course. In reality it is holding the world somewhere on the brink. And therefore, all people and all countries must be extremely vigilant against this course because the nuclear madmen may go over the brink.

However, we consider the forces that oppose this trend, headed by the U.S. Administration, are also great. Presently they are being reinforced by a powerful antiwar movement. People are recognizing the strength of their voice in the struggle for peace and their influence on governments and states aimed at preserving peace. And it seems to me that people who cherish the preservation of everything on earth created by mankind should not and cannot permit the development of world events to take a course which would lead to nuclear confrontation.

[Zorin] Thank you very much. Obviously we did not cover all questions which we received but it is probably impossible to do this in one program. I wish to thank you, Leonid Mitrofanovich, for your comments to our television viewers and to thank our television viewers for their attention. And so, until we meet again here in our Studio 9, thank you comrades.

USSR, JAPAN SIGN SALMON ACCORD IN MOSCOW

OW241345 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 23 Apr 83

[Text] Soviet-Japanese government-level talks on Japanese salmon fish quotas and fishing terms in the Northwestern Pacific outside the exclusive fishing zone of the USSR ended at the Soviet Fish Industry Ministry building in Moscow on 22 April. Through the talks, which began in Moscow on 21 April, the two sides agreed to set the ceiling for Japanese salmon catches in northwestern Pacific waters at 42,500 tons, the same as last year. They also agreed to increase Japanese fishery cooperation fees payable to the Soviet Union by 250 million yen over last year to 4.25 billion yen.

Signing the protocol, which spelled out these points of agreement, were from the Soviet side, Soviet Fish Industry Minister Vladimir Kamentsev, and from the Japanese side, Japanese Charge d'Affaires Hisashi Owada. An annex to the protocol was signed by Soviet First Deputy Fish Industry Minister Nikolay Kudryatsev and Mr Hisashi Owada.

In a speech that followed the signing ceremony, Minister of the Fish Industry Kamentsev said: Cooperation in fishing between our two countries has already gone on for years, and I would like to point out that this cooperation has stood the test of time. While countries in the world were staking out 200-mile exclusive fishery zones, the Soviet Union and Japan found ways to cooperate ahead of others. Moreover, our two countries have settled problems so that the fishermen of each side could continue to operate in their fishing grounds as before. Cooperation between us is very extensive, ecompassing goverment-level cooperation, cooperation through various regional and international agencies, and economic and technological cooperation. I am very happy that we could sign these documents today. The successful conclusion of our negotiations demonstrates once again the fact that if each party has the will, the two sides can find a way for solving problems. I would like to stress that Soviet-Japanese fishery cooperation can serve as a good model for cooperation in all other areas.

Japanese Charge d'Affaires Owada said: I think the agreement reached between the Japanese and Soviet Governments today should be highly appraised as an event that has added another page in the history of fishery cooperation between the two countries. In conducting the negotiations this time, the two sides made good use of their past experiences and took into consideration the trend in fishing resources in recent years. They exchanged their frank views and made sincere efforts to conclude successful talks based on mutual understanding and the spirit of reciprocity, which were strengthened during the Kanemaru-Kamentsev talks last February. I am happy that despite various difficulties, we have been able to conclude the talks quickly and very effectively.

Hisashi Owada, head of the Japanese delegation, then thanked Minister of the Fish Industry Kamentsev, First Deputy Minister of the Fish Industry Kudryatsev, and other members of the Soviet delegation for their efforts in the successful conclusion of the talks.

USSR, EGYPT SIGN CULTURAL-SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION PLAN

LD240952 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 24 Apr 83

[Text] A plan for cultural and scientific cooperation between the USSR and the Arab Republic of Egypt for 1983-84 has been signed in the Egyptian capital. Measures are envisaged for the extension of cooperation in the fields of culture, science, education, information and sports. Exchanges in the performing arts, cinematography, and book publishing will also increase. [Cairo MENA in Arabic at 1705 GMT on 23 April reports that the agreement was signed "for Egypt by Ambassador 'Ali Shawqi al-Hadidi, head of the Foreign Ministry's Cultural Relations and Technical Cooperation Department, and for the Soviet side by Ambassador Yuriy Kirichenko, chairman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries Department."]

'ARAFAT RECEIVES MESSAGE FROM SOVIET 'LEADERSHIP'

LD222203 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1753 GMT 22 Apr 83

[Text] Tunis, April 22, (WAFA) -- PLO Chairman Yasir 'Arafat today (Friday) received a letter from the Soviet leadership relating to the latest developments in the Middle East. The letter was delivered to Chairman 'Arafat by the Soviet ambassador to (?Tunisia). The ambassador was given a reply to be delivered to the Soviet leadership.

SOVIET DELEGATION HOLDS TALKS WITH PLO'S ABU MAZIN

LD222318 Algiers Voice of Palestine in Arabic 1702 GMT 22 Apr 83

[Text] Yuriy Barabash, chairman of the Soviet Society for Friendship and Solidarity With the Palestinian People [title as heard] and first deputy minister of culture, arrived [place, date not specified] at the head of a Soviet delegation on a 4-day visit for talks with the PLO.

The delegation met with Abu Mazin [Mahmud 'Abbas], member of the PLO Executive Committee and chairman of the Palestinian-Soviet Friendship Society. The question of developing and strengthening relations of friendship between the Palestinian and Soviet peoples and developing the work of the two societies in a manner serving their [word indistinct] aims were discussed during the meeting. Current Middle East issues, particularly developments concerning the Palestinian issue, were also discussed.

PLO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONCLUDES TUNIS MEETING

LD222340 Moscow TASS in English 2308 GMT 22 Apr 83

[Text] Tunis April 22 TASS -- Meetings of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization that were held for two days ended in the capital of Tunisia today. The meetings were presided over by Yasir 'Arafat.

The PLO Executive Committee has analysed the results of the Palestinian-Jordanian talks that were held recently in Amman and has confirmed again the adherence of the Palestine Liberation Organization to the resolutions of the Arab summit meeting in Fes.

Members of the PLO Executive Committee, having discussed the situation on occupied lands have emphasised the need of rendering all-out support to the forces of resistance on Israel-occupied lands. The situation of the Palestinian population in Lebanon has also been discussed.

Upon the conclusion of the meeting of the PLO Executive Committee Yasir 'Arafat left by air for Morocco.

REAGAN ANNOUNCES SHULTZ VISIT TO MIDDLE EAST

LD230110 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1959 GMT 22 Apr 83

[Text] Washington, 22 Apr (TASS) -- Speaking at an unofficial press conference today, President Reagan announced tht he is sending U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz to the Middle East. In Reagan's words, the official purpose of Shultz' trip is to conclude the talks with Lebanon on the withdrawal of all foreign troops from its territory. However, in the view of the press, Shultz' trip is primarily intended to try and rescue Reagan's notorious "Middle-East initiative," which has been a total failure.

Reagan tried to put the blame for the failure of his "initiative" on "radical elements" in the PLO. Moreover, he completely ruled out the right of the PLO to take part in a peace settlement in the Middle East, which demonstrates once again his total scorn for the rights and destiny of the Palestinian people and his support for the ultraextremist rulers of Israel, who with obvious encouragement from the United States, are preparing to annex the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip.

EAGLEBERGER ARRIVES IN BEIRUT 22 APRIL

LD222044 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1500 GMT 22 Apr 83

[Text] The U.S. delegation appointed by President Reagan today arrived in Beirut. The delegation is led by U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Eagleberger. Foreign news agencies report that the question of sending U.S. Secretary of State Shultz to the Middle East is being studied in Washington. Observers link these [word indistinct] with the Reagan administration's attempts to impose its Middle East settlement plan on the peoples of the region. Former Lebanese President Sulayman Franjiyah has recently stated that all Washington's actions, including the Reagan plan for a settlement in the Middle East, only serve the interests of Israel.

SOVIET PUBLIC ANTI-ZIONIST COMMITTEE CREATED

LD211132 Moscow TASS in English 1308 GMT 21 Apr 83

[Text] Moscow April 21 TASS -- Representatives of several public organisations gathered in Moscow today to examine the initiative of a group of Soviet citizens to set up an anti-Zionist committee of the Soviet public. The proposal was backed by representatives of non-governmental organisations, prominent scientists, workers in culture, factory workers and farmers. The initiative group received after their appeal had been published in the press many letters and telegrams wholeheartedly supporting the idea of setting up an anti-Zionist committee and expressing desire to take part in its work.

Those present at the meeting unanimously voted in favour of establishing an anti-Zionist committee of the Soviet public. Twice Hero of the Soviet Union, Colonel General David Dragunskiy has been elected its chairman. Professor Samiul Zivs, doctor of law and merited worker in science of the Russian Federation, became first deputy chairman of the committee. Mark Krupkin, deputy director of the NOVOSTI press agency publishing house, Igor Belyayev, head of a LITERATURNAYA GAZETA department and doctor of economics, and Yuriy Kolesnikov, an author, were elected deputies.

LENIN'S 113TH BIRTHDAY CELEBRATED IN MOSCOW

Itinerary of Events

LD221710 [Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian at 1256 GMT on 22 April begins a relay of the festive events held at the Kremlin on the occasion of Lenin's birthday.

The relay opens with shots of the audience in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses, comprising political and social activists and members of the Armed Forces. At 1300 GMT the audience rises to applaud as the leaders are seen entering the front of the hall in order: Grishin, Andropov, Gromyko, Borbachev, Tikhonov, Ponomarev, Pelshe, Ustinov, Aliyev, Solomentsev, and other unidentified figures.

Next the leaders are seen taking their seats. A pan shot shows the front row comprising, from left to right: Gorbachev, Gromyko, Andropov, Grishin, Tikhonov, Pelshe, Ustinov, Aliyev, and USSR Academy of Sciences President Aleksandrov; and the second row comprising: from left to right, Arkhipov, Ponomarev, Kuznetsov, Solomentsev, Demichev, Dolgikh, Kapitonov, Zimyanin, and Rusakov. Other figures, including Yepishev, Shitikov, Ruben, Ogarkov, and Tereshkova are also present. Chernenko is not seen.

At 1301 GMT Grishin mounts the podium and declares the meeting open as follows:

"Comrades, the festive session devoted to the 113th anniversary of the birthday of the founder of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, the brilliant theoretician of Marxism, leader of the international working class, teacher and friend of the working people of the entire world, Vladimir Ilich Lenin, is hereby declared open."

At this point all rise for the playing of the national anthem. Grishin then continues:

"Member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is called upon to deliver the report, 'Leninism, a Living, Creative Teaching, a True Guide to Action.'" Gorbachev thereupon commences his address at 1303 GMT.

At various points during Gorbachev's speech Ustinov is seen conversing with Tikhonov and Andropov is seen conversing with Gromyko and Grishin. Ustinov, Andropov, and Gromyko are seen passing notes at this time.

Gorbachev concludes his speech at 1401 GMT, whereupon Grishin declares the festive meeting concluded. There is then a break, during which a concert of light music is screened.

At 1452 GMT, following the break, Moscow television resumes its Kremlin relay devoted to Lenin's birthday. The opening scene is of the audience at the Kremlin concert hall as the orchestra tunes up. At 1455 GMT the leadership is seen entering a balcony led by Andropov, followed by an usher, then Tikhonov, Grishin, Gromyko, Ustinov, Pelshe, Gorbachev, and Aliyev. Next the camera shows some leaders taking their seats in the order, from left to right, Gromyko, Tikhonov, Andropov and Pelshe. Dolgikh and Kuznetsov are also seen entering the balcony at this time.

The concert begins at 1458 GMT. Performances including music, dance, and recitation are shown. At 1550 GMT the concert ends. The leaders are seen standing and applauding in the balcony in the order, from left to right, Dolgikh, Ponomarev, Ustinov, Gromyko, Tikhonov, Andropov, Pelshe, Grishin, Gorbachev, Aliyev, Kuznetsov, and Demichev.

An unidentified figure stands to the left of Dolgikh. At 1551 GMT the leaders turn to leave the balcony, whereupon the relay concludes.

Gorbachev Lenin Birthday Speech

PM251029 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Apr 83 p 1-3

[Report by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, to the festive meeting in honor of the 113th anniversary of Lenin's birth in the Kremlin Hall of Congresses: "Leninism Is a Living, Creative Teaching and Correct Guide to Action"]

[Text] Comrades, 22 April has gone down in the calendar of history as the birthday of Vladimir Ilich Lenin, a man whose name has become a symbol of the revolutionary renovation of the world, whose teachings reign over the minds of advanced mankind and are embodied in social practice on a world historic scale.

In marking this date that is dear to us all, we repeatedly express our boundless respect and love for Lenin the thinker and revolutionary, for Lenin the leader and teacher, for Lenin the inspiration of the October Revolution and the creator of our party and state. (prolonged applause) The genius of a theoretician and the unyielding steadfastness of a champion of the proletariat were uniquely fused into Lenin's personality. He was set apart by his profound understanding of the interests of the working class and supreme insight both as a strategist and as a tactician, his bold thought and strictest realism in assessing the current moment, an unshakable belief in the inexhaustibility of the historic creative ability of the working class and the ability to find talented organizers from among the people.

His extremely close ties with the masses provided Lenin with a sense of being able to grasp their mood and aspirations and to find true answers to some of the most complex questions of the revolutionary struggle and the building of socialism. Lenin is an unfading example to his pupils and followers; he is always with us. With a sense of great pride we repeat the moving lines: Lenin is still more alive than all the living; he is our knowledge, strength, and weapon. (applause)

This year marks the centenary of Marx' death. Time has brought unprecedented victories for Marx' teachings. The present epoch, an epoch of the sharpest turn in the history of mankind, from the old society of exploiters to a new socialist society, has become a triumph for Marxism. It is precisely because the historic destinies of Karl Marx' teachings were established in this way, that inestimably great is the role of Vladimir Ilich Lenin, who defended Marxism against revisionist distortions and elevated it to a new, higher plane.

Lenin and Marx lived and worked at different times, but history has united their names for all time. It has united them with ideological substance; unity of purpose, of life, and common character in the struggle for the cause of the social emancipation of the working class and the working people of the whole world.

Worldwide historical experience has convincingly shown that Marxism-Leninism is a unified and indivisible doctrine; that Leninism is Marxism of modern time, possessing inexhaustible vitality and energy. Having confirmed the truth of Leninism, history also passed its verdict on "detractors" [nisprovergateli] and "critics" [gritiki]. All attempts to set Lenin against Marx and Marx against Lenin and to break up the unified revolutionary doctrine turned out to be futile. Several different concepts and doctrines concerning the local limited nature of Leninism, or alleging that it is obsolete, became defunct and fell apart.

Leninist ideas are alive and victorious. (applause) The life-creating force of revolutionary theory is its truth, its creative essence, and its capacity for further development under the influence of social practice. Lenin himself incessantly stressed that Marxism is not a dogma but a guide to action. Precisely the same is also the case with Leninism: It is not a collection of congealed dogmas and ready panaceas, but is the theories and methods of a dialectic thinking and analysis for a revolutionary transformation of reality.

Leninism today is not merely a system of scientific truths and revolutionary views; it is the transformed world of the 20th century itself, socialism that has become a reality for one-third of the world's population; it is mankind's advance along the path of social and national liberation. Social progress is invincible; it is taking place according to the laws discovered by Marxism-Leninism. (applause)

Leninism is the banner of construction of socialist and communist society in the USSR, the basis of the party's policy. Grand and strenuous work is now underway on the expanses of our motherland in order to fulfill the plans of the 26th CPSU Congress. The party and the people are full of will and energy to solve successfully the enormous creative tasks the country is facing. The closes cohesion of the Soviet people, of all the nations and ethnic groups around the Leninist party and its Central Committee was vividly demonstrated during the celebrations of the 60th anniversary of the formation of the USSR. The unity of our society was manifested with particular force in the nationwide support for the decisions of the November Central Committee plenum. It is with unanimous approval that our people welcomed the election of Yuriy Vladimorivich Andropov to the post of general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. (prolonged applause)

Soviet people view these decisions as the consistent continuation of the party's Leninist course and of its domestic and foreign policy. The working people fully approve and support the measures being implemented by the Politburo to improve the work of state and economic organs, to enhance discipline and order, to raise the responsibility of cadres, to ensure strict observance of laws, to increase further the country's economic potential and to reliably guarantee the security interests of the Soviet Union and of our allies and friends, as an expression of the party's unflagging concern for the well-being of the Soviet man, for the all-round flourishing of the socialist motherland and for the preservation of peace on earth. (applause)

For the Intensive Development of the Economy, for the Highly Productive Labor of the Millions

Reviewing the path progressed since the October [Revolution], and constantly checking our current practice against Lenin's ideas, we say with complete justification: The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is implementing confidently and with honor the teaching and behests of the great Lenin. (applause)

Comrades! The science of construction of socialism and communism is the apex of the Leninist teaching. Guided by the fundamental conclusion of Marx and Engels that the socialist system of economy is only established when the dominance of the exploiter classes has been overthrown, Lenin exposed and refuted antiscientific and anti-Marxist conceptions about the possibility of transition to socialism without the working class winning political power and without a revolutionary upheaval regarding property. Creatively developing Marxism's theses on the new society, he drafted the plan for construction of socialism in our country.

Sixty years have passed since Lenin dictated the last articles and letters which in essence go to make up his political bequeathal. The broad theoretical and political insights into socialism and communism contained in them took in the experience of the first real steps in construction of the new life. In these articles and letters, Lenin developed a program of practical actions to set up a broad network of economic and organizational relationships embracing the most important spheres of activity of the Soviet state.

The might and scientific profundity of Lenin's foresight is striking. In a difficult period, when the already retarded country was ruined to the extreme by the imperialist and then the civil wars and by foreign intervention, when the world bourgeoisie, having failed to attain its aims by military force, was strangling the young republic of the Soviets with an economic blockade, Lenin clearly showed the way to the socialist future. Rejoicing at the first successes in the construction of socialism, and proud of them, Lenin at the same time, unlike any other, boldly revealed and soberly evaluated shortcomings and contradictions and proposed carefully thought out measures to eliminate and overcome them. He warned against hotheadedness in resolving economic and social tasks, called for the essence of the processes taking place in the economy to be gone into profoundly for all the pluses and minuses to be known and for energetic, sure-fire action on this basis.

Fulfilling the behests of the great Lenin, our country has in a brief historical space of time reached high levels of social progress. With the labor and talents of the people, led by the Communist Party, the most progressive society has been created, a society with a mighty economy, modern science and culture, genuine rule by the people, and a humane way of life.

Lenin's theoretical legacy is an invaluable attribute in the party's work for the perfection of a developed socialist society. Leninist tenets concerning the fullest consideration of the demands of objective economic laws, concerning planning and economic cost-effectiveness, the skillful use of cash-commodity relations and material and moral incentives today continue to serve as an accurate guide in the party's activity in running the national economy.

The Leninist approach to solving economic problems and tackling practical tasks of economic and cultural construction is excellent training for all our cadres. Basing itself on the Lenininist method of analyzing social processes, the CPSU elaborated at the 26th Congress the main guidelines for the country's economic and social development for the eighties. On the basis of the unshakable principles of Marxism-Leninism, in the process of collective creativity the party scientifically generalizes its practical experience and constantly enriches its theoretical base with new tenets and conclusions.

The peculiar features of the present stage of life in the country and the nature of current and long-term tasks have been examined comprehensively in Comrade Andropov's article: The Teaching of Karl Marx and Certain Questions Pertaining to Socialist Construction in the USSR. Imbued with a spirit of creativity, it profoundly and realistically throws light on the key problems of improving the economy, socialist democracy, and the whole system of social relations.

The first half of the 5-year plan is coming to a close, and no small success has been achieved in its fulfillment. The economic might of the country has grown, its defense capability has been strengthened, and the material and cultural level of the life of the people has risen. At the same time, the party can also see unresolved problems: Not all the targets of the first years of the 5-year plan were met, and this applies both to individual quanitative production indices and to production efficiency.

This was discussed with a Leninist sense of principle and an attitude of irreconcilability toward shortcomings at the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee plenum, at which decisions concerning the persistent search for ways and means to accelerate our advancement were reached.

By responding in deeds to the plenum's appeal to work in a more organized manner and more productively, to strengthen discipline and order, the country's working people have achieved not a bad start in the struggle for fulfilling the plan for 1983. There has been an increase in the rates of industrial production, whose output in comparison with the first one-fourth of last year has increased by 4.7 percent, while labor productivity increased 3.9 percent. There has been a discernible growth in the procurement of milk and meat; an improvement has been noted in rail transport. Soviet people have marked the Leninist communist subbotnik with shock labor. To consolidate what has been achieved, to develop successes, to fulfill and overfulfill the plans of the present year -- these are the tasks that the party poses today to every labor collective, ministry, oblast, kray, and republic. It is very important that the plan tasks are fulfilled, not only in total volume of production, but also in natural indicators, coordinated deliveries, labor productivity, reduction of primary production costs, and improvement of quality. This is an essential condition for a balanced development of the national economy and for a more complete satisfaction of public demand. The current tasks of the CPSU are always integrally combined with strategic tasks, and truly define the leading directions of our development. According to Lenin's idea, the only material basis for socialism can be a large engineering industry capable also of reorganizing agriculture. The development of heavy industry has been and remains the unconditional prerequisite for the solution of all economic and social tasks. It was precisely in this way, in Leninist style, that the 26th party congress viewed this question.

What is the most important thing here? Accelerating the development and raising the level of engineering as the basis for the technical re-equipment of social production as well as applying contemporary techniques to improve the quality of goods. The achievements of domestic engineering are indisputable. At the same time, it is no secret that the introduction of many scientific discoveries and design developments, which promise a great saving of resources and national economic effect, are today coming up against the lagging behind of individual links of the industry. Therefore, the above-average and all-round growth of engineering, a considerable improvement in the quality of the machines and equipment being produced, was and remains the main road for developing heavy industry and for intensifying its transitional role in the expansion and and radical renewal of the funds for all branches of the national economy. It is of essential importance to implement the USSR's recently adopted long-term energy program, supplying the national economy with fuel and energy as well as raw materials, metals, and other construction materials; to develop chemistry; and to improve capital construction.

An important place in Lenin's activities was taken up by questions of agrarian theory and agrarian policy. He did not conceive of the political victory of the proletariat without a firm alliance with the working peasantry, the building of a new society without the switchover of the mass of small farms onto the rails of major public farms, and the socialist economy without a developed agrarian sector. Questions of radical transformations in the countryside were worked out by him with great thoroughness in post-October works. Lenin's cooperative plan, being an integral part of the overall plan for building socialism in the USSR, pointed the peasantry to the sole correct path to socialism. The realization of that great plan, the creation of the kolkhoz system in our country, is the historic achievement of Leninism and the party's agrarian policy.

Lenin's proposals on the agrarian question are of paramount significance today too. They are the scientific foundation of the party's activity aimed at boosting the productive forces of agriculture and at improving socioeconomic relations in the countryside.

This was reflected in the decisions of the 26th congress of our party and the May 1982 Central Committee plenum as, before it, the March 1965 Central Committee plenum.

The USSR Food Program, which was adopted a year ago, is a living embodiment of Lenin's ideas on a reliable foodstuffs fund for the country and all-round progress of the countryside in conditions of mature socialism. Its fulfillment is seen by the Communist Party and the Soviet Government as the most urgent and important task.

The current year is bringing considerable changes to the countryside. Implementation is fully under way of the measures drawn up by the May [1982] Central Committee plenum, measures of a socioeconomic, technical, and organizational order. They are designed to promote the rapid growth of agricultural production. This is also the job of the new democratic organs of management enjoying full rights, which are uniting the efforts of kolkhozes, sovkhozes and enterprises of other industries. This is the aim of the new purchase prices and increments for produce sold to the state. The scale of housebuilding, cultural amenities, and consumer facilities is being expanded, and considerably too, so that the living conditions of rural workers will improve and cadres will be further encouraged to stay in the countryside.

It is very important for the Food Program, which affects the vital interests of all Soviet people, to be implemented too as a matter for the whole people. In the towns and, above all, in major industrial centers, a broad movement is underway to meet the schedule for orders from the agroindustrial complex. The CPSU Central Committee fervently supports this patriotic initiative and expresses confidence that our heroic working class, workers of industry, construction, and transport will make a worthy contribution to the implementation of the USSR Food Program. (applause)

But it is quite understandable that the main responsibility for the promptest solving of the Food Program lies with the workers in agriculture and the sectors connected with it. Now, when the whole of the agroindustrial complex is being placed on a modern industrial basis; when the scale of mechanization, chemicalization, and land improvement is being expanded; and when new mechanism of management is being introduced; the prerequisites are being created in reality to weaken the effect of unfavorable weather conditions on agricultural production, to raise its stability and efficiency.

The Central Committee puts the question as follows: Everything that has been mapped out by the May plenum for the countryside -- capital investments, equipment, chemical agents, and other material resources -- must be fulfilled unconditionally. Moreover, as was stressed in Comrade Andropov's address at the CPSU Central Committee conference, the responsibility of the workers at kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and at all enterprises of the agroindustrial complex to resolutely improve the utilization both of the already existing base of supplies and equipment and of the huge funds and resources which are being newly allocated by the state must be increased. Less references to weather and to so-called objective causes; more order on the land; strictness and economy in the use of machines, fertilizers, irrigated areas, fodders, financial resources, and all resources of production; more specific and everyday concern for raising the yield of fields and the productivity of farm units -- this is what we now need most of all. (applause)

Comrades, the realization of the Food Program -- which occupies a central place in our plans -- does, of course, not exhaust all tasks connected with raising the people's well-being. Their solution requires growing attention for the entire complex of sectors engaged in the production of goods and services for the population. This follows from the party's directions aimed at an ever-deeper turn in the national economy toward satisfying the varied needs of Soviet people on the basis of raising the efficiency of the whole of public sector production.

And these directions will be implemented consistently and persistently.

Relying on a powerful economic and scientific-technical potential, the state is now channelling ever-more funds not only into agriculture but also into light industry, sectors of chemistry and trade, and toward improving housing conditions and consumer services. This means, in practice, that in public sector production the process of the formation of such a structure as is capable of ensuring the further progress of heavy industry, the creation of a solid food base, and of a complex of highly-developed sectors directly directed towards the needs of the population is in progress. This is in accord with the objective demands of the economy of developed socialism and corresponds to Lenin's interpretation of the question of the purpose and final aim of producing the means of production.

In the 11th 5-Year Plan, as is known, provision is made for the above-average growth of the production of consumer goods, as compared with producing the means of production. This line is being maintained in current plans and is producing results. At the same time, far from all opportunities have been used here and not all reserves have been put into operation. It should be added that the effective demand and the quality standards which the population now applies to assessing goods and services have grown. The absence of a number of goods from sale and the low quality of many products, arouse quite a few complaints on the part of the consumers. The Central Committee Politburo and the USSR Council of Ministers are taking account of this. A whole series of additional measures to expand the production of consumer goods, their range, and to improve their quality, have now been worked out. Ministries and departments, local party, and administrative organs, are called upon more energetically and more effectively [predmetno] to concern themselves with increasing the output of these goods; to better assimilate capital investment in the light and chemical industries, in trade, and in the consumer services field; to speed up their technical equipment; and to do everything necessary for the more complete satisfaction of the everyday needs of the working people.

Comrades: The simultaneous solution of such large-scale production and socioeconomic tasks presupposes primarily the intensification of publicly-owned production; it is here that the party sees the main source of the dynamic growth of the economy. To conduct intensive production means constantly to display concern for raising labor productivity at each workplace, each enterprise, in all branches of the national economy; in brief, on nationwide scale. Today, when the country has a huge production potential at its disposal, it is important to utilize it in full measure, to save not only manpower but also indirect labor [trud oveshchestvlennyy], labor embodied in machine tools, machines, raw and other materials. Only thus can a real effect be achieved, since high labor productivity means also economy of the resources being utilized.

Raising labor productivity without reducing the cost of the product, Lenin considered, is an absurdity if this is just taken as a general feature. High rates of growth of labor productivity lie at the basis of the achievements of the Soviet economy and the economies of the fraternal socialist countries. It is these that will to a decisive extent determine our future successes too. This is why the November Central Committee plenum posed so acutely the question of speeding up the growth in labor productivity in the national economy. In order to achieve this, and achieve it in the near future, fuller use should be made everywhere of the existing capacities and reserves, the achievements of scientific-technical progress should be introduced more energetically, new approaches to the management of production and the organization and remuneration of labor should be sought.

On the initiative of the working people themselves such progressive forms of labor organization and material incentives as the Shchekino method, team-contracting forms of organizing labor in industry and construction, and collective contracting in the countryside have been introduced in recent years.

These valuable initiatives have been approved by the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers, and have been recommended for widescale practical implementation. It is important for the managers of enterprises and industries, for party and administrative bodies, and trade union organizations to understand the significance of this matter; and for them to regard the assimilation of progressive experience as a norm of management. Contemporary production with its complex and expensive equipment and the very nature of work makes incomparably higher demands on all that which is called the human factor in the economy: standards in the handling of equipment; and the professional skill, creativity, and discipline of workers. Without this neither labor productivity nor the quality of output can be raised.

Unconscientious work by an individual in the production of services sector, or at any workbench will sooner or later, in one form or another affect not only the public interest by also the individual's interests, rebounding in the shape of substandard goods or services. Strengthening discipline is the concern of everybody; it involves everyone, every worker and manager at every level, without exception.

The overall progress of the economy and the development of new forms of socialist democratism are intimately linked with the stepping up of the activity of labor collectives. Discussion of the USSR draft law on labor collectives and the enhancement of their role in running enterprises, institutions, and organizations is currently under way in the country. Everywhere the necessity for and usefulness of such a law is being stressed. As it develops Lenin's ideas concerning the increasingly broad involvement of working people in production management, it will be of great political, socio-economic, and educational significance.

This also defines fresh tasks for primary party organizations. They march in the vanguard of labor collectives; and the organizers and educators of the masses will perform their role of political nuclei all the more successfully the higher their combativeness and activity, and the more deep-seated the personal responsibility of Communists for the state of affairs at the factory and for the whole of the activity of the collective.

The party's policy directed toward comprehensive rise in the productivity of public-sector labor and the efficiency of the economy provides for improvements in the running of the national economy. Definite steps are being taken in this sphere. But as has been indicated by Comrade Andropov, our work aimed at improving and restructuring the economic mechanism, and the forms and methods of management, has failed to keep up with the demands made by the level of material and technical, social and moral development that Soviet society has reached.

The CPSU Central Committee has defined the basic directions for perfecting the economic mechanism. Now in central and local general economic organs, in scientific organizations, and at enterprises specific proposals directed at raising the efficiency of the economic mechanism are being worked out. The aim of this work is to find such measures whose implementation will permit an acceleration of scientific and technical progress, an intensification of the struggle for conserving resources, a more effective stimulation of highly productive labor. In particular, this concerns such an important question of management as determining the optimum combination of centralized planning and the economic independence of the enterprises, of local organs, their initiative and enterprise, with economic responsibility to society.

Here, as ever, there is reliable support in Lenin's legacy, his teaching about democratic centralism. With the scientific conviction and political passion typical of Lenin, he consistently defended centralism as the original starting point in the organization of the economy of socialism, presenting a single whole.

At the same time he called for the road to be opened for local creativity and initiative. Our task, said Lenin, is to give a push locally everywhere, to give the maximum of initiative, and to show the maximum of independence and boldness.

Comrades, every new stage in the development of the economy, is naturally and logically the cause of a profound change in social class and relations among nationalities in the entire political superstructure. It powerfully stimulates an increase in the spiritual potential of society, the development of science, and the formation of literature and art. The increased merging of class social groups, the internationalization of all spheres of social life, the consolidation of the fraternal friendship of the peoples of the USSR, the improvement of socialist democracy are clear facets of the major transformations that the contemporary stage of advanced socialism brings. Their total result is a further strengthening of the social and ideological-political cohesion of the Soviet people, the hero-people, the toiler-people, the creator-people. (applause)

The country is living in an intense working rhythm. Every day brings us good news about labor achievements. New initiatives are born. In the vanguard of the all-union competition are Muscovites. The capital's working people have always served as an example, a model, of selfless, truly heroic, labor. The patriotic initiatives of the Moscow enterprises to reinforce discipline under the slogan, "Honor and Glory Through Labor," has been taken up by the whole country. In the activeness of the masses, the wide sweep of socialist competition, the highly productive toil of millions, there lies the guarantee of a successful fulfillment of the national economy plan for the 3d year of the 5-year plan, of our progressive advance forward.

Strengthening the Link With the Masses, Improving Forms and Methods of Work

Comrades, socialism belongs to the working people; it is a live creation of the millions. The gigantic upsurge of people's labor and political activity, the deep interest shown by the masses in the destinies of socialism is something that provides a mighty acceleration to our society's progress. Lenin noted with pride that ideologically and morally we were stronger than anyone from the first day of Soviet power. This he said, has been tested in practice. This is proven not by words, but by deeds; it has already been proven once and, very likely, if history takes a certain course, it will be proven many times. Indeed history has proven it repeatedly. The ideological and moral force of socialism was tested at the sharpest of historical turns. This was the case during the years of industrialization and collectivization, during the severe trials of the Great Patriotic War and during the period of post-war reconstruction. Likewise now, during the contemporary stage of socialist construction, devotion to the idea and high conscientiousness remains the greatest wealth of Soviet society. (applause)

It is in the furnace of class battles, in the creative toil that the unity of the party and the people took shape, became strong and was made durable. The party does not conceive of itself as being outside of the people; and the people believe, see, in the Leninist party its reliable vanguard, its wise teacher and tested leader that consistently expresses its interests. The party's ideological, political, and organizational unity; its inseparable link with the people is the source of strength of socialism, a guarantee of all our victories. (applause)

While valuing the trust of the working people above all else, the CPSU makes high demands of Communists, manifesting unceasing concern for elevating the title and significance of being a party member.

Being the leading force of the socialist society, it constantly learns from the people deriving its revolutionary optimism and energy from the spring of creativity of the masses.

A resolute improvement in the style of our work, and of methods of party and state leadership, assumes the foremost significance as far as the fulfillment of complex and large-scale tasks facing us is concerned, as far as the further stepping up of activity by Communists and all toilers from the towns and the countryside is concerned. As is known, Vladimir Ilich Lenin pondered a great deal on the problems of work forms and methods. Where are the dividing lines between the application of economic and administrative methods of management? What are the functions of party, state, and economic organs in economic and cultural construction? What is the best way of taking into account the entire varied range of interests and of making use of them for common purposes? How and by what means is good organization and the achievement of good results of work to be ensured?

All this constituted a subject about which Vladimir Ilich was constantly concerned. By resolving these questions theoretically and applying the drawn up recommendations, Lenin in practice, was the creator of a new leadership workstyle, a style which was absorbed by the revolutionary, scientific, and humane nature of our ideology, policy, and the multifaceted experience of socialist transformations. That is why the Leninist style, with its requirement for people to act through the force of authority, vigor, greater experience, greater diversity, and greater talent, has been and remains for us the best reference point, a kind of yardstick for the improvement of work forms and methods. Working in the Leninist manner means, first and foremost, to regard the interests of the entire state and people as being of paramount importance. This is particularly important because relationships in the country's national economy are becoming increasingly complex. The implementation of major socioeconomic and territorial production programs affects the interests of many industries, republics, krays and oblasts.

These programs can only be successfully resolved on the basis of a profound understanding of general interests, of united and well coordinated endeavors. In improving the sector-by-sector principle of management and raising the role and responsibility of local organs, we are at the same time definitely proceeding from the priority given to general state interests. This obliges us, in big things and small things, in economic and educational matters, to seek a national effect, above all, to resolutely oppose departmentalism and manifestations of vested interest. Working in the Leninist manner means being properly organized, businesslike, and purposeful. These Bolshevik features have always manifested themselves clearly in all our accomplishments. Work with specific aims, socialist enterprise, and a creative approach to the solution of tasks that arise are indispensable conditions for efficiency in all our work. One should not collect shortcomings or look for excuses for why a certain result was not achieved. Instead, one should overcome everything that hinders this, intelligently and persistently adopt advanced practices and, generally speaking, organize work in an exemplary manner. Punctiliousness in everything is an absolute requirement for everybody. A project that has been started must be carried through to completion. A word that has been given must be kept. Plans that have been outlined and pledges that have been adopted must be fulfilled.

One needs to speak about this because responsibility and efficiency are still lacking in many areas of work. This quite often leads to serious shortcomings, plan adjustment, inertia [omertvleniye] of materials, nonoperative capacities, and, at times, cases of eyewash and coloring of the facts. That is why a further stepping up of party and people's control over implementation of government directives, as well as systematic checks of the true situation, is so important.

A situation cannot be considered justified when a large number of people, instead of engaging in lively organizational work, in a number of cases take to developing spurious measures, and when they conduct various unnecessary conferences and meetings.

The CPSU Central Committee opposes this practice. The party is in favor of a style of work that rules out formalism and red-tape, idle talk, inertia, and sluggishness. Work, as Lenin taught, means to work with an eye to the future, to rely on science and sober calculation and to foresee the consequences of decisions. This, in essence, first and foremost, is directed toward an integrated approach. An ability to deeply weigh up all the circumstances and factors of an economic, social, cadre, and psychological order to pool the efforts of all sections of economic activity, both vertically and horizontally to find the optimum ways to achieve each specific goal and joint resolution of each task -- that is what is particularly valuable today. If these requirements are not observed, we will have to face not only material and financial costs, but moral-political ones, too.

In accordance with the directives of the CPSU Central Committee, planning, economic, and administrative bodies, and party committees must work seriously in this direction, bearing in mind that adoption of optimum decisions is unthinkable without taking careful consideration of existing experience and scientific recommendations, and comparing various points of view, and without giving wide publicity to the work of administrative bodies.

Party committees are called upon to set an example of correct leadership methods. The success of implementing the party's policy depends to a decisive degree on how they operate, how skillfully they combine organizational and ideological-education work, how they elevate the vanguard role of communists, how closely linked they are with the masses and how they work with cadres.

Lenin never tired of emphasizing that employees should be judged not by words but by their practical deeds. Prestige does not come simply through holding office; it is won by hard work, a sense of principle, attentiveness to people, and a sense of exactingness toward everything, the combination of which goes to form the moral outlook and the example of a leader. At every post there should be workers for whom the interests of the party and the people come first, who are industrious, have a profound knowledge of their job, and have a feeling for what is new, a critical attitude toward their own work, and who are just and honorable. These are the kind of workers whom the party values and the people respect. (applause)

Comrades, the point of the party's efforts to improve management and raise organization, efficiency, and plan, state, and labor discipline; indicated Comrade Andropov, consists not only in getting rid of certain shortcomings and difficulties, which in itself is of enormous significance; but also, in the final analysis, in further consolidating the foundations upon which the socialist way of life is based. We all want the country to become richer and the people's living conditions to improve. But little comes from simply wishing. It is only selfless labor and the concern of everyone for the common good that ensure the steady growth in production and a rise in the people's well-being.

It is also important to emphasize this, because more and more new generations are entering productive and public life. It cannot be assumed that young people will automatically assimilate the ideological and moral wealth of their fathers and mothers -- the habit of work, the striving to live worthily, and serve society honorably. The family, school, higher educational establishments, Komsomol, trade unions, soviets of people's deputies, and all labor collectives are called upon more actively and purposefully to shape these lofty qualities of the socialist personality.

Socialism is creating a new system of values. Setting for itself the aim of achieving the complete fullness of the material and spiritual life of man, our society, unlike bourgeois society, must not proceed along the path of consumerism, which cripples the complete vitality of human life. Socialist society has sensible requirements that do not lead to money-grubbing [styazhatelstva], petty accumulation [nakopitelstva], and mercenary-mindedness [torgashestvo], nor do they diverge from the principles of socialist labor ethics. However, there are still people who have nothing against violating our moral principles and laws, and enrich themselves at the expense of society. The conduct of such persons draws the indignation of the working people and the protest of each man living by his honorable labor.

This obliges us consistently and uncomprisingly to act against any aberrant behavior. (applause) That struggle, indicated Lenin, can be brought to a conclusion only if the popular masses help. It goes without saying that the force of the law should also be brought to bear whenever necessary. After all, antisocial manifestations are fed not least by illusions of total permissibility and impunity. There should be no place in our society for such illusions, and the Soviet people have the right to expect active, faultless, and qualified action from the law enforcement organs in defending the interests of society and the individual. (applause)

We are living in conditions of unabating, most acute ideological confrontation on the international scene. Bourgeois ideologists are making every effort to shake the ideological conviction of Soviet people by making use of the most sordid weaponry, lies and slander, and by falsifying facts. That is why vigilance is essential. Any attack on our principles, on our life have encountered and will encounter the most decisive rebuff. (applause)

We are confident that the final victory in the struggle of ideas will be on the side of truth and humanity, on the side of Marxist-Leninist ideology. (prolonged applause)

Defending Peace -- There Is No More Important Task Now

Comrades! The CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government are doing immense work in order to preserve and consolidate peace. Implementing the course of the 26th congress and striving for the realization of the Peace Program for the Eighties, we support the sensible organization of international relations and first and foremost, the averting of war. The latest Soviet peace initiatives set forth by Comrade Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov express the sincere aspiration to return the development of events on to the track of detente, and open up fresh opportunities for assertion of the norms of peaceful coexistence in international life. Every step by the Soviet Union, each initiative, is an embodiment of the great Lenin's behests. The Leninist strategy of peace and the Leninist principles of socialist foreign policy determine the whole international activity of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

The years in which we are living will go down in history as a time of intense class struggle in the foreign arena. Two courses, two diametrically different approaches to international relations confront each other unusually acutely. The main reason for the deterioration of today's international situation is the adventuristic approach of the most aggressive forces of imperialism to the most important issue of modern times, the issue of war and peace, Lenin pointed out, cannot be posed properly if class antagonism of modern society is overlooked. Imperialist reaction can hide behind any mask, but it is not capable of concealing that its current foreign policy course is dictated by narrow, selfish, class interests. The striving for maximum profit, for perpetuation of a society of oppression and exploitation, and for world domination lies at the foundation of imperialism's antipeople course.

Lenin's description of imperialism and the forces which motivate its policy thus retains its significance.

The capitalist system is experiencing a profound crisis. It embraces the economy and politics, and the material and spiritual life of bourgeois society. The contradictions between labor and capital, between imperialist and liberated states, and between the centers of the forces within the capitalist world, are becoming worse. The most diehard strata of the imperialist bourgeoisie are putting the blame for the strategic weakening of the exploiter society not on its internal contradictions, not on its internal logic of development, but on socialism and its international policy. In these circumstances, the reactionary tendency has triumphed in U.S. ruling circles. The war party -- to use Lenin's expression -- has gained the upper hand. It tells itself that force must be used immediately, taking no account of further consequences. The most aggressive circles of imperialism, primarily American imperialism, are trying to get out of the crisis, to find a response to the historic challenge of socialism by means of the arms race and by increasing the threat of war.

The aggressive strivings of imperialism are directed first and foremost against the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community. Economic sanctions and psychological war, attempts to organize a crusade against communism, interference in the internal affairs of socialist states, up to and including the nurturing of a counterrevolutionary fifth column, as for example in Poland -- all this is factual reality, irrefutable facts. Imperialist reaction, as has already happened more than once, is hungrily waiting for a reply of history, to stifle world socialism, to put a brake on the popular liberation movement. In essence they are giving an ultimatum to socialism: Unless it gives up its positions, things will slide toward war. But the alternative -- either submission to the dictate of imperialism on a world scale, or a world war -- is mad and monstrous in its very basis. The policies of imperialism, and the imperialist approach are countered by our socialist approach to international problems, in which the fundamental interests of the working masses are embodied. We are convinced that social progress cannot be halted. The historic process of mankind's move toward socialism cannot be hindered. And socialism is peace. (applause)

In the Soviet Union, in the fraternal socialist countries there are no forces in need of war, an arms race, or aggravation of the international situation. Peace, relaxation of tension, universal security, fair and mutually-favorable cooperation, inviolability of the right of the peoples to social and national progress, to independent determination of their destinies -- such are our clean and open aims.

A reliable compass in the struggle for a radical improvement of the international situation, said Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, delivering the review report of the Central Committee at the 26th congress, was and remains the program of peace worked out by the CPSU. (applause)

A most important factor in the struggle for peace is the growing unity of the fraternal socialist states, their close cohesion and loyalty to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism. The determination to bar the road to war was once again shown by the Prague conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee.

In the struggle to avert war we consider the central task to be the curbing of the arms race, which is now moving into a qualitatively new, much more dangerous phase.

Neglecting the vital interests of the peoples, the U.S. Administration is behaving irresponsibly, having decided to continue limitlessly building up the existing reserves of nuclear weapons and to relentlessly conduct a race in all types of strategic armaments. Under the false cover of the zero option, the interim solution and other subterfuges, the U.S. imperialists are moving headlong, counting on the deployment of their medium-range missiles in Western Europe at any cost, thus turning its peoples into nuclear hostages of the United States.

Hitherto the United States and its partners in NATO have not replied to the unilateral step of the Soviet Union not to make first use of nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union is countering the attempts of the United States to use the talks to upset the existing balance of forces with the constructive idea of an arms reduction in which, as a first step, the overall balance would be preserved, but at the lowest possible levels. Working for a transition to disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, our country does not seek military supremacy. We sincerely strive for success at the talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic armaments and on problems of medium-range nuclear armaments in Europe. We are ready for an agreement based on reciprocity, taking into consideration legitimate interests, and in keeping with the principle of equality and equal security. This line is an honest approach; this line is witness to our good will.

The might of the defensive alliance of the countries of the Warsaw Treaty is guarding peace and the gains of socialism. If the situation demands it, the peoples of the socialist community are doing and will do everything necessary in order that their defense should be even stronger; even more effective. Surrounded by the love of the entire people and the concern of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, the USSR's Armed Forces are vigilantly protecting the peaceful life of Soviet people and of the entire community of the fraternal socialist countries. (applause)

Let those who love adventures not forget this. To use Lenin's words: We will not let ourselves be hurt. We have not been beaten, will not be beaten, and will not be deceived. (Prolonged applause)

Comrades! The imperial ambitions of the United States, the arms race, the cult of force, and the propaganda of war all make the imperialists' approach to international problems a universal danger. It is well known that the aggressive tendencies of the ruling circles of the Western camp are being resisted by a more realistic, sober tendency, whose supporters are in favor of detente and cooperation. The development of ties between the Soviet Union and many Western countries shows that we have considerable areas of converging interests. This is a fine basis for the further implementation of Lenin's principle of peaceful coexistence in international relations.

The powerful upsurge of the antiwar movement, which has engulfed the globe, has become a sign of the time. There is a warning in Lenin's words: War is terrible, and the broad masses of the people sense this with increasing gravity. The appeal "No to War" is resounding throughout Europe. It has met with a response in the United States and it has been heard throughout the planet. The antiwar movement has now grown into an influential factor of international life. The ruling circles of the United States and the other NATO countries are having to take account of the actions of public forces against the arms race and against the deployment of American missiles in West Europe. These actions express a new level of human consciousness and activity of the masses.

Communists, Social Democrats, Christians, Liberals, trade union, religious, women's, youth, and other organizations in many ways approach the struggle for peace from various political and ideological positions. But they have a common goal -- not to permit the catastrophe that the instigators of war are preparing for mankind. The conviction that this goal is attainable is growing all the time. War can and must be averted. (applause)

Our Communist comrades are in the front ranks of the fighters against war. The communist and workers parties are unstintingly fighting to forestall a thermonuclear war, stepping up the struggle of the people's masses against the danger of war, and are rightly pointing to imperialism as its social source. We appreciate the antiwar, anti-imperialist, and anticolonial thrust of the Nonaligned Movement, which was confirmed by the Delhi conference. In the liberated states there is an increasing understanding of the fact that the attainment of full political and economic independence, upsurge in the national economy, and the democratic restructuring of international economic relations are only possible in close liaison with the struggle against the arms race and the threat of war.

We note with satisfaction that our peaceful initiatives are in the same direction as the ideas of our friends and receive their support. This was stated during the days of celebration of the 60th anniversary of the Soviet Union by representatives of communist and workers, revolutionary democratic, national patriotic and other parties. Evidence of this, too, is the broad approval of the proposals put forward in the Political Consultative Committee of the member-states of the Warsaw Treaty in Prague.

Our country regards it as its historic responsibility to erect an insurmountable barrier against the misanthropic course of imperialism. We are motivated by concern not just for the security of the Soviet people and the fraternal peoples of the socialist countries but for the future of civilization in general. The strengthening of peace is the guiding principle for the future of international relations. The USSR favors the elimination of the tension in the international situation and normal, good relations with all states, including the United States. (applause)

We are guided by the fundamental conclusion of the 26th party congress: There is no more important task now in international terms than to defend peace. True Leinists, we will spare no effort for the triumph of peace and for ensuring a peaceful future for mankind. (prolonged applause)

Dear comrades. The present Lenin anniversary coincides with the 80th anniversary of the Second Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Workers Party. It is to Lenin's great credit that it was precisely then that the great idea of creating the party was implemented. Since then Lenin and the party have become inseparable for us. Lenin's thought and Lenin's will are embodied in the diverse activity of the CPSU. History has entrusted us Communists with the most valuable spiritual asset that mankind possesses, the ideological legacy of the thinkers, and revolutionaries of genius -- Marx, Engels, and Lenin. We preserve it sacredly and are justifiably proud of the great mission that Marxism-Leninism performs in the present-day world.

Basing itself upon that legacy and adapting itself to the requirements of life, the CPSU creatively develops the mighty teaching. Communist ideas and the victorious theory of Marxism-Leninism illuminate for us the path into the future. Under this ideogical banner the Soviet people have scored historic victories.

We have before us, comrades, great innovative tasks, and however complex they may be and whatever efforts they require, we will be able to resolve them.

The guarantee of this is the leading role of Lenin's party, the creative energy of the Soviet people, and our steadfast adherence to Leninism. (prolonged applause)

Long live Leninism, the doctrine that is alive and developing, a reliable guide to action! (prolonged applause)

Glory to the great Soviet people! (prolonged applause)

Long live the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, created by the great Lenin! (prolonged applause)

PRAVDA Editorial

PM221929 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Apr 83 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Under the Leninist Banner"]

[Text] The Soviet people and all progressive mankind celebrate the 113th anniversary of Vladimir Ilich Lenin's birth today.

The name of Lenin, the greatest revolutionary and thinker, is dear to all working people on the planet. Lenin's all-conquering teaching, which is rightly described as the Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, of the colonial system's collapse, and of mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism, has become the symbol of the rebuilding of the world and the revolutionary banner of our times.

Lenin's contribution to the development of Marxism and to the creative realization of the fundamental ideas of scientific communism has now become the invaluable property of all fighters for social and national liberation, socialism, peace and progress. Lenin elaborated the theory of socialist revolution and personally headed the masses' struggle during the unforgettable days of October 1917, having by his ideas and his example pointed the way to overthrowing the exploiters' yoke and asserting and consolidating the power of the working class in alliance with all the working people. He has armed 20th-century revolutionaries with a teaching on the party of a new type and with the experience of setting up such a party, thus giving the fighters for peoples' happiness the key to combining the mass workers' movement with scientific socialism and to turning this party into "the teacher, guide, and leader of all working people." The culmination of Lenin's theoretical was the scientific substantiation of the ways of building socialism, whose first victories were won under Ilich's direct leadership.

Lenin's genius lights up the path along which mankind is advancing toward the ideals of social justice and real humanitarianism. These ideals are being successfully translated into reality over vast expanses of the planet. The society of developed socialism built by the efforts of generations of Soviet people led by the Leninist party is the highest stage of social progress reached to date. The main content of the party's and people's activity now consists in perfecting all its aspects and in revealing the historical advantages of socialism. This calls for the further boosting of production forces; the development and consolidation of collectivist social relations, Soviet statehood and democracy, socialist consciousness, science, and culture.

A condition for the successful resolution of the tasks facing our society is leadership by the Communist Party educated and moulded by great Lenin and utterly devoted to Leninism. Its entire political biography is a heroic path of struggle and victories. In a stage by stage natural process the party scored new gains and scaled new heights.

"In 80 years it has grown from a small revolutionary Marxists' organization into a powerful united party which now has a membership of more than 18 million communists," the CPSU Central Committee resolution on the 80th anniversary of the Second RSDRP Congress notes. "Having become the party of the whole people, in conditions of developed socialism the CPSU has not lost its class nature and remains in its essence a party of the working class. The role of the Communist Party in the life of the Soviet society is steadily growing."

The CPSU's strong in its loyalty to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and revolutionary traditions, in its firm unity and ideological staunchness, in the lofty moral and political qualities of Communists, and in its close links with the masses. "The guarantee of all our future victories lies in strengthening the unity between the party and the people and firmly following the great Lenin's behests," Comrade Yu.V. Andropov has stated.

Soviet people are marking the 113th anniversary of V.I. Lenin's birth in an atmosphere of labor and political enthusiasm. The main tasks of the current year of the 5-year plan and ways of implementing the 26th CPSU Congress decisions are clearly and precisely defined in the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) plenum decisions and other party documents. Workers, kolkhoz members, and representatives of the intelligentsia are striving to implement the plans outlined by the party by means of shock labor. The volume of industrial production has increased by 4.7 percent in comparison with the first quarter of last year. In 1982 this indicator amounted to 2.1 percent. Labor productivity has increased by 3.9 percent in comparison with 1.5 percent in the first quarter of last year. The Leninist communist subbotnik held throughout the country turned into a paean of labor. Some 157 million people took part in it and each of them as it were, came into direct contact again with Lenin's idea of the greatness of free labor which makes man the genuine master of his country.

All the international activity of our party is embued with loyalty to Lenin's ideas. The principles of proletarian, socialist and internationalism, and peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, advanced and scientifically substantiated by Lenin, are being consistently applied in the Soviet Union's foreign policy. The CPSU and the Soviet state everything possible to strengthen the unity and cohesion of the socialist countries and to render assistance and support to present-day revolutionary and progressive movements. The Peace Program for the Eighties adopted by the 26th CPSU Congress signposts a realistic and practical way of ridding mankind of the threat of thermonuclear war and delivering it from the burden of the arms race.

Lenin's immortal ideas and deeds and his life serve as an inexhaustible source of inspiration and optimism for Soviet people and working people throughout the world. And for each one of us there is no better calling than to place all one's energy, all one's mind and will at the service of the great cause championed by Vladimir Ilich.

Under Lenin's banner, under the leadership of the Communist Party forward to the victory of communism!

IZVESTIYA Editorial

PM221528 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Apr 83 Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial: "By the Great Road of Creation and Peace"]

[Excerpt] Although a brilliant theoretician who harnessed Marxist teaching to the truly geological changes of the contemporary era and raised this teaching to a new and higher level, Lenin did not worship theory but treated it creatively.

He rejected theory ossified by the lava of dogmatism, transformed into a register of truisms, and nourishing the forces of inertia not progress. He persistently appealed: "...to check that science does not remain a dead letter or a fashionable phrase with us, (and it must be owned that this happens particularly often with us) and that science really becomes part of our flesh and blood and is transformed fully and genuinely into an integral element of everyday life." It is precisely such a science, organically and inseparably linked with the practice of socialist building, that is the basis of the Leninist party's policy. It is only Marxist-Leninist science and an active and creative attitude to it that makes it possible not to become detached from life and to be ready for any surprises. In other words: "...to act as communism really demands." This is exactly how Lenin acted. Ilich's attitude to theory is an example for every builder of a new society, socialist or communist, an example both to the simple workers and the major state leader.

Everybody knows Lenin's words: "The teaching of Marx is all-powerful because it is true." The scientific veracity [vyverennost] Marxist-Leninist theory, creative and dynamic, also lies at the basis of all the CPSU's activity in foreign policy. It is the guarantee of the success of this activity.

Lenin's dream of a world without war seemed unrealizable, especially as it hovered over the earth at a time when our planet was in the grip of the convulsions of bloody carnage. But even this dream of Lenin's had solid wings of theory and science. Now, when almost 40 years have elapsed since the end of World War II and when imperialism wishes but does not dare draw from their sheaths the Damoclean swords of nuclear confrontation, we can see for ourselves once again the titanic practical force and scientific soundness of the Lenin's dream of peace, a dream imbued with great humanism. The peace program elaborated and being implemented by the CPSU is in fact Lenin's dream of peace in action! Its success is irrefutable evidence that it is not only necessary but also possible to avert war.

Every individual is a battlefield soldier in the struggle for peace. Every Soviet person, whoever he is an wherever he works, must fight for peace in the Leninist way. Our country, the great Soviet Union, is a bulwark of peace throughout the world. The fate of the whole planet and all mankind -- whether it is to continue to exist or not -- depends to a tremendous extent on the degree of the Soviet Union's strength and might. This is why the solution of the big and small economic problems which face our country as a whole and each of us individually go far beyond the framework of the purely everyday concerns of the Soviet state. They add up to something much bigger -- the foundation of the world without war of which Lenin dreamed and which he foresaw.

Lenin's teaching and his great example of service of the lofty ideals of the liberation of the working people from the oppression of capital today arms tens and hundreds of millions of people for the struggle for peace and for the right to build a life worthy of man. The guarantee of the success of this struggle is fidelity to the ideals of Marx-Lenin.

Under the banner of Lenin, under the leadership of the Communist Party -- forward to the victory of communism!

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Editorial

PM221207 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Apr 83 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "The Banner of the Epoch"]

[Excerpts] Leninism is the CPSU's ideological banner and weapon.

Creatively developing Lenin's teaching, the party tirelessly conducts theoretical work, resolves the tasks of communist building on a genuinely scientific basis, and improves ideological and political education activity among the masses.

Today the Communist Party and the Soviet people are solving the complex, difficult tasks of improving developed socialism. These tasks, defined by the 26th party congress and the CPSU Central Committee May and November (1982) plenums, will be successfully fulfilled because the party constantly aligns its policy and plans with Lenin's instructions.

The party accords the greatest significance to absolute observance of Leninist norms of party and state activity, the affirmation of a Leninist work style which organically combines scientific foresight with realism, high organization and initiative, professionalism, and a critical attitude toward shortcomings. It has also laid stress on increasing the monitoring of the execution of decisions and enhancing the party, state, and labor discipline.

In order to solve the great constructive tasks our people need durable peace and reliable security. True to the Leninist principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, our party has consistently and persistently conducted a struggle to maintain and consolidate peace and the relaxation of tension, to curb the forces of war and aggression, and to prevent a world nuclear catastrophe.

While unwaveringly defending the cause of peace and the people's security, the CPSU and the Soviet state at the same time realise that, so long as imperialism clings to its desire to upset the existing balance of forces and achieve military superiority, it is important to provide the Soviet Armed Forces with everything necessary to defend the USSR and its allies and friends. Following Lenin's behest, the Communist Party and the Soviet state have invariably manifested great vigilance and taken the necessary measures to strengthen our motherland's defense capability.

In conditions of a growing military threat from imperialism the Soviet Armed Forces' servicemen see it as their duty, at V.I. Lenin's behest, to study military matters in a proper fashion, to master persistently and tenaciously modern equipment and weapons, to improve tirelessly ideological tempering, to strengthen discipline to the maximum, and enhance vigilance and combat readiness.

Lenin's teaching is a guide to action for all fighter for the interests of the working class and the freedom and happiness of the peoples and is the source from which they derive their strength, energy and inspiration in labor and struggle.

Long live Marxism-Leninism, the eternally living revolutionary international teaching!

SOVIET SOURCE SAYS BREZHNEV'S SON TO BE REMOVED

OW230404 Hong Kong AFP in English 0332 GMT 23 Apr 83

[Text] Moscow April 23 (AF) -- Yuriy Brezhnev, the son of the late Soviet president Leonid Brezhnev, could soon fall from his position as the second ranking official in the Foreign Trade Ministry because of relationships with people of doubtful morality, an informed Soviet source said here Friday.

In official terms, Mr Brezhnev, 49, will be "freed from his duties" as first vice-foreign trade minister, a position he has held since 1979 thanks to the patronage of his father, who looked after all his "clan," observers here said.

As a preliminary step to remove Mr Brezhnev, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet recently conferred on him "a diploma of honor" in gratitude for "his long and fruitful work in the field of foreign trade."

Mr Brezhnev was named a vice-foriegn trade minister in 1976 and first vice-minister in 1979.

In 1981, he was elected to the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee, and his name was frequently mentioned as a strong candidate to succeed Nikolay Patolichev, the current foreign trade minister.

His fortunes began to sour in 1982 when a campaign to discredit the Brezhnev family began.

Security agents opened an investigation into questionable activities, and rumors began to circulate that he would leave the Soviet Union to work in an embassy.

Also in early 1982, Soviet authorities revealed the arrests of two friends of his sister Galina on smuggling charges -- the director and a performer in the Moscow Circus.

At the time of Leonid Brezhnev's death last November, rumors began that another close friend of the Brezhnev family, the director of Yeliseyev Food Store on Gorkiy Street, would be arrested on the same charges.

The director today is behind bars.

OFFICIAL RELIEVED OF POSTS; REPLACEMENTS MADE

Georgian Trade Minister

PM250747 [Editorial Report] Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian on 17 April carries on page 1 the text of a Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet decree dated Tbilisi, 16 April, appointing Merab Musayevich Kadzhaya Georgian SSR minister of trade.

The same paper carries on page 3 a GRUZINFORM report that G.L. Koblianidze has been relieved of his duties as minister of trade "at his personal request."

RSFSR Health Minister

PM221212 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Apr 83 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed "Announcement"]

[Text] The RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Comrade N.T. Trubilin RSFSR minister of health, releasing Comrade V.V. Trofimov from that post in connection with his retirement.

REPORT ON FIRST QUARTER ACHIEVEMENTS, SHORTFALLS

LD231755 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 23 Apr 83

[Text] The country's industrial workers have fulfilled the first quarter's plan for the marketing of production by 102 percent. A report by the USSR Central Statistical Directorate on the results of the fulfillment of the state plan says that the increase in industrial production in comparison with the corresponding period of last year amounted to 4.7 percent. Labor productivity rose by 3.9 per cent, accounting for 85 percent of the increase in industrial production.

The plan has been fulfilled for the extraction of oil, gas, and coal, and for the production of fininshed rolled ferrous metals, steel pipes, motor vehicle tires, forging and pressing machinery, instruments, automation and computer equipment, diesel and electric locomotives, newsprint, prefabricated reinforced concrete, mineral fertilizers, tractors and other agricultural machinery. The planned increase in the production of the majority of consumer goods in ensured.

The USSR Central Statistical Directorate report also notes that production associations and enterprises of the ministries of ferrous metallurgy, the coal industry, the petroleum refining and petrochemical industry, power machine building, heavy and transport machine building, and the timber, pulp and paper and wood processing industry, have not ensured the supply of produce to consumers in accordance with contracts which had been concluded and orders which had been accepted for fulfillment.

The plan has not been fulfilled for the production of synthetic resins and plastics, chemical fibers and yarns, alternating current electric motors, commerical timbers, knitwear goods and leather footwear. Individual production associations and enterprises have not fulfilled their plans for labor productivity, costs and accumulations, and scientific-technical program tasks. The technical re-equipment and reconstruction of working enterprises and shops has contined, as has the introduction of progressive resource-saving technological processes. Output of more than 700 new industrial products has begun. Industrial collectives, associations and enterprises are conducting work to intensify production, improve labor organization, strengthen discipline, increase production output and to raise quality.

Further Details

LD231801 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 23 Apr 83

[Text] According to a report issued by the USSR Central Statistical Directorate, in the past 3 months the growth in output was 4.7 percent compared with the same period last year, thus surpassing the planned target set for the whole of the present year. The plan for the marketing of industrial output was overfulfilled by 2 percent, or by almost R3 billion. The first quarter's target was successfully met by all union republics and industrial ministries, except for the Ministry of Light Industry.

There was a discernible tendency toward improvement of the main indicators, the structure of industrial production underwent improvement, and branches of industry which determine scientific-technical progress developed at a fast pace. In the fuel, energy and raw materials industries, the extraction of gas and generation of electricity by nuclear power stations developed at an accelerated pace.

In machine building, high rates of growth were achieved in the production of radio and electronic equipment, industrial robots and machines, and equipment with higher technical and economic parameters.

Labor productivity increased by 3.9 percent; this was the source of the main growth in industrial output. In a number of machine-building industries it accounted for all the growth, and almost all the growth in the food and fish industries.

Fulfillment of the Food Program has become one of the most important tasks for many branches of our industry. Industries supplying equipment and mineral fertilizers to agriculture have achieved accelerated development. By comparison with the same period last year, production of agricultural machines and machines for stockbreeding and fodder production increased by 8 percent, while production of mineral fertilizers rose by 12 percent.

However, individual associations and enterprises of the ministries of ferrous metallurgy, the chemical industry, heavy and transport machine building, and the timber, pulp and paper and wood processing industry failed to fulfill the plan for the production of a number of the most important types of industrial output, as well as their pledges regarding contractual agreements and orders.

The planned growth in the production of the majority of consumer goods such as cotton and linen fabrics, edible fish products, butter and vegetable oil, whole-milk products, china and glazed ware, washing machines and furniture, was achieved. Output of many consumer goods produced by heavy industry enterprises also increased.

RSFSR COUNCIL OF MINISTERS NOTES ECONOMIC GROWTH

LD222128 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1830 GMT 22 Apr 83

[Text] The working people of the RSFSR maintained a growth in the economy and an increase in living standards in the first quarter of the year. This was noted today at a session of the Council of Ministers of the republic.

Industrial output has grown, labor productivity has increased and the planned tasks for volume of sales has been fulfilled by industry in Moscow, Leningrad, and all autonomous republics, krays and oblasts except Kaluga, Kuybyshev and Chita Oblasts. The Ministry of Light Industry and the Ministry of Textile Industry failed to fulfill their quarterly plan for this category.

At the Council of Ministers session it was noted that agricultural workers had successfully begun spring sowing. Field work in many rayons in being conducted at a fast pace.

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS FOR 22-24 APRIL

LD250350 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 22-24 April. Times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

22 April

Mass sowing of potato tubers has begun in Bryansk Oblast, which has the largest areas devoted to potatoes in the RSFSR -- 117,000 hectares. Harrowing has begun in the Barnaul areas. (0000 GMT)

Farms of the Mari Nonchernozem Zone have completed the preparation of agricultural machinery, testing is underway of irrigation systems. Mass sowing of corn grain crops is underway in Kirghiziya. This year, over 125,000 hectares of irrigated lands has been allocated to corn, of which a third is given over to corn grain crops. The rate of sowing is three times faster than last year. Corn has already been sown on half the allocated area. (0100 GMT)

Sowing of early grain crops ended today in Volgograd Oblast; almost 2,300 hectares have been sown. The last hectare of beet is being sown today in the Ukraine; sugar beet plantation in the republic will occupy more than 1.7 million hectares this year. (0700 GMT)

Sowing of sugar beets has started in Belorussian Polesye; 20,000 hectares have been given over to the crop. Mass sowing of spring crops is underway in Mari ASSR. (0800 GMT)

23 April

Sowing of early grain crops has begun in Gorkiy Oblast; more than 40,000 hectares have already been sown. Sowing is beginning in south Orenburg Oblast, where 3.8 million hectares are to be sown for grain crops. Fallow-tilling has begun in south Kazakhstan. (0000 GMT)

In the Kuban, 250,000 hectares have been sown for corn, more than a third of the area designated for this crop. A sharp drop in temperature and frequent rain have slowed down sowing work somewhat. The weather is now settled and corn sowing is proceeding more rapidly. Rice is now being sown in the Kuban, and 172,000 hectares are now designated for this crop in the area. (0204 GMT)

24 April

Sowing is proceeding rapidly in the Bolga valley. Grain crops, grasses, sunflowers, sugar beets, and vegetables are being sown on 400,000 - 450,000 hectares. (0000 GMT)

The first 150,000 hectares of grain crops have been sown in Tatar ASSR, where early grain crops will cover around 2 million hectares. This year, 250,000 hectares will be sown for peas here. (0204 GMT)

Belorussian field work: Sowing of spring grain has been completed on the first million hectares. (0800 GMT)

Pavlodar Oblast mechanizers have begun mass spring fieldwork. All farms are working on moisture retention and sowing perennial grasses, while in the south, the early grain crop sowing will start soon.

This year in the oblast, grain crops will occupy 2 million hectares. (2005 GMT)

Swerdlovsk Oblast farmers started sowing of spring grain crops on an area of more than 800,000 hectares. (2300 GMT)

SHCHERBITSKIY AT CONFERENCE ON FOOD PRODUCTION

AU221310 Kiev Domestic Service in Ukranian 1700 GMT 21 Apr 83

[Text] Concrete tasks stemming from the conference held on 18 April 1983 in the CPSU Central Committee headquarters on some practical questions concerning the development of agriculture and the implementation of the Food Program were discussed recently in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Headquarters with the participation of leaders of Ukranian agricultural and other ministries and departments, and responsible functionaries of the Ukranian Communist Party Central Committee and Council of Ministers.

Among those taking the fllor in the discussion on a plan for activity aimed at raising the effectiveness of agricultural production and at overcoming the existing shortcomings were: Vladimir Vasilyevich Shcherbitskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Ukranian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary; Titarenko and Mozgovoy, Ukranian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo candidate members; and Ukranian Council of Ministers deputy chairmen.

While delienating the concrete steps planned, Comrade Shcherbitskiy pointed out that, in order to implement the decisions of the 26th party congress, of the May and November 1982 CPSU Central Committee plenums, to comply with the instruction given by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, for further increasing the production and procurements of agricultural and stockbreeding produce, and to fulfill the plans for the current year and the 5-year period as a whole, it was essential to make efforts primarily to improve organizational and political work, to raise business ability and competence of cadres, and to increase their responsibility for accomplishing all tasks set for the agroindustrial complex. Attention was drawn to the need to analyze profoundly and in good time the state of affairs at each farm, in every rayon and oblast, and to assess the achievements attained in a selfcritical manner.

A definite plan was endorsed for accomplishing tasks set at the conference in the CPSU Central Committee headquarters, and appropriate instructions were issued for ministries and departments.

USSR LAUNCHES ARTIFICIAL SATELLITE COSMOS-1445

LD250706 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0651 GMT 25 Apr 83

[Text] Moscow, 25 Apr (TASS) -- The latest artificial earth satellite, Cosmos-1455, was launched in the Soviet Union on 23 [as received] April 1983.

The satellite has on board scientific apparatus designed for continuing space research.

The satellite has been put into orbit with the following parameters: initial period of orbit, 97.8 minutes; apogee, 676 km; perigee, 648 km; inclination of orbit, 82.5 degrees.

Apart from scientific apparatus, the satellite has a radio system for the precise measurement of elements of the orbit, and a radio telemetry system for transmitting data to Earth on the functioning of the instruments and scientific apparatus.

The apparatus installed on the satellite is working normally. The coordinating and computing center is processing incoming information.

SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE HELD IN BAKU 23 APRIL

GF241656 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0105 GMT 24 Apr 83

[Text] A practical scientific conference at the republic level was held in Baku on 23 April. The participants of the conference discussed in detail -- in the light of the 26th CPSU Congress and the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum -- concrete measures aimed at increasing the output of labor in industry and perfecting the planning related to this output. Kyamran Bagirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, attended the session.

Feridun Aliyev, secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee [name and title as heard], addressed the conference on party duties regarding increasing output of labor in the light of the 26th CPSU congress and the CPSU Central Committee Plenum decisions. The conference later heard (Lidya) Rasulova, chairman of the Trade Union Council of Azerbaijan, discuss the consolidation of work discipline, increasing socialist competition in raising labor output, and developing [word indistinct] economic enterprises of the republic. (Pablo Gorich), full member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, also addressed the conference on rural economy and matters related to increasing production. After the addresses, the practical scientific conference continued its deliberations. The participants of the conference approved recommendations made for increasing labor output.

The deliberations of the republic's scientific conference were attended by (Oktay) Bagirov, Yuriy Kubashev, Gasan Seidov, Suleyman Tatliyev, Gasan Gasanov, (Vagip) Guseynov, [name indistinct] (Sendiyev), and Dzhangir Muslimzade -- members and candidate members of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Politburo.